Walter Adams.

SOUTHERN BRANCH,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
LIBRARY,
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Southern Branch
of the
University of California
Los Angeles

Form L 1

P101
M74o
v.4

Th "E on the last date stamped below

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/oforiginprogress04monbiala

OF THE

ORIGIN AND PROGRESS

OF

LANGUAGE.

Graiis ingenium, Graiis dedit ore rotundo
Muſa loqui.——— HORAT.

VOL. IV.

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED FOR J. BELL, EDINBURGH.

AND

T. CADELL, IN THE STRAND, LONDON.

M.DCC.LXXXVII.

50488

P101
M740
V.4

THE CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

Of the different Excellencies and Defects of different Languages.

Pag.

Introduction, - - 1

Ch.

1. *No beauty in any art without variety.—There muſt, therefore, in a perfect language, be a great variety of ſounds.—The variety of the ſound in the termination particularly to be*

Ch. Pag.

attended to.—Defect of the ancient Perſian language in this reſpect.—Defect of the languages of the South Sea in point of variety of ſound.—A perfect language muſt be ſweet in the ſound, as well as various, but not too ſweet of ſound.—The barbarous languages defective in this, being too vocal.—The words muſt not be too ſhort.—The Barbarous languages go to another extreme.—The ſound of a language much raiſed by the uſe of diphthongs.—The Barbarous languages defective in this.—The difference of ſpirits *in pronunciation makes an agreeable variety.—This the Barbarous languages have.—The quantity of ſyllables, or the* rhythm, *makes another variety.—This ſome of the Barbarous languages have.—Of the melody of language.—Some languages of Savage nations have melody,* 4

2. *Words conſidered as ſignificant.—In a language of art there muſt be of them a ſufficient number to expreſs all*

Ch. Pag.

the variety of things.—Defect of Barbarous languages in this reſpect.—There muſt not be a redundancy, any more than a defect of words.—This prevented by that art of language we call flection.—*In this the Barbarous languages very defective.—The words of the language ſhould convey the meaning fully and accurately,—alſo without obſcurity or ambiguity.—In both theſe articles Barbarous languages are defective.—They ſupply the defect by tones of the voice.—Words, that have a connection in their meaning, connected together in their ſound by* derivation *and* compoſition.—*The Barbarous languages want this art.—The want of words ſupplied by* metaphors *and other trops.—In this the Barbarous languages are not deficient,—but moſt deficient of all in ſyntax.—Reaſons for this.—All languages ſpoken by Barbarous nations not barbarous,* - - 12

Ch. Pag.

3. *Greater variety both of ſound and ſenſe in compoſition than in ſingle words.—The greater variety the greater beauty,—alſo the greater difficulty.—The wonderful variety of compoſition in the learned languages. Of compoſition in the Barbarous languages.—There muſt be more or leſs of the art of compoſition among ſuch Barbarous nations as hold public aſſemblies, and therein make harangues. —A ſtory to that purpoſe,* 20

4. *An account of the Greek language.—This the moſt perfect language the author knows.—Its reſemblance to the Sanſcrit language of India.—From the Greek language the author has formed his notion of what is moſt perfect in language.—Of the ſound of the Greek language.—More ſounds in it than we can pronounce.—Vowels in Homer frequently gaping upon one another.—Alſo* rhymes, *both of verſes and of hemiſtics.—The words in Greek neither too ſhort nor too long.*

Ch. Pag.

—*The ſhorteſt words are thoſe that occur the moſt frequently, ſuch as Conjunctions and Prepoſitions.—The terminations of the Greek words moſt various and moſt pleaſant to the ear.—None of their words terminate in mute conſonants.—Difference of* ſpirits *in Greek.—This ſhould not be confounded with* loud *and* low.*—No ſuch diſtinction betwixt the ſyllables of the ſame word in Greek or Latin.* 24

5. *Of the muſic of the Greek language.—It conſiſts, like other muſic, of* melody *and* rhythm.*—It has melody in ſucceſſion, and may be conſidered as having muſic in parts.—Of the difference betwixt the melody of muſic and that of ſpeech.—Of the* rhythm *of the Greek language, and the beauty it muſt have given to their pronunciations.—The muſic of language known even among ſome Barbarous nations.—The northern nations of Europe probably got their language from nations who ſpoke a muſical language;*

Ch. Pag.

but not having a genius for muſic, they loſt that part of the language.—The Greeks a moſt muſical nation,—got the elements of muſic from Egypt, but improved it very much.—Of the muſic of the Indians of North America, how they came to have muſic in their language accounted for.—Concluſion of what is ſaid upon the ſound of the Greek language.—Neceſſity of analyſing it, as has been done, in order to form a right judgment of it. 34

6. *Of the words of the Greek language, conſidered as ſignificant.—The art of the Greek language moſt wonderful in this reſpect.—Of the* noun, *and the various things denoted by its declenſion.—Of the* verb, *and the ſtill greater variety of expreſſion by it.—Of the words in Greek formed from the verb.—The Greek verb, though expreſſing ſo many different things, not incumbered or overloaded.* 43

7. *Of the* compoſition *in Greek.--The uſe of it in ſaving words, and making the*

Ch. Pag.

ſyſtem of the language more perfect.—Of the variety of its compoſition with verbs and prepoſitions.—Of derivation *in the Greek language.—The account, given by the author, of the Greek derivation, makes the language a wonderful ſyſtem of art.—The ſame was the ſyſtem of Hempſterhuſius.—Not probable that both Hempſterhuſius and the Author ſhould have fallen into the ſame error, without communication with one another.—Other arguments in favour of this ſyſtem of etymology.—The Greek, according to this ſyſtem, reſembles very much the Sanſcrit language.—The language of Homer particularly has a wonderful reſemblance to that language.* - 51

8. *Of* compoſition *in Greek—the greateſt beauty of all—requires variety as much as any thing elſe belonging to language.—The arrangement in Greek wonderfully various.—By a proper arrangement the ſenſe conveyed more*

Ch. Pag.

forcibly than it could be otherwiſe.—This compoſition, though difficult to be underſtood at firſt, becomes eaſy.—It appeared ſo beautiful to the ſcholars that flouriſhed after the reſtoration of letters, that they diſdained to write in their vernacular tongue.—Of the many particles uſed in Greek.—The uſe of theſe particles, both with reſpect to the ſenſe and ſound.—Of the wonderful beauty of the compoſition of Demoſthenes, when pronounced by himſelf - 59

9. *Of the* Latin *language.—That language the oldeſt dialect of the Greek—liker therefore to the Oriental Languages.—It has tones, but not ſo accurately marked as in Greek.—But the quantity of ſyllables accurately obſerved in it.—As to* ſpirits, *much fewer aſpirates than in Greek.—The Latin language defective in the elemental ſounds, particularly in diphthongs.—Theſe the Latins commonly reſolve.—Examples of this.—*

Ch. Pag.

The greateſt difference of all betwixt the ſound of the two languages is, that the Latins terminate ſo many words in mute conſonants, the Greeks none at all.—The terminations of -orum *and* -arum, *in the Latin language, not pleaſant.* - - 71

10. *The words of the Latin language conſidered as ſignificant.—In that reſpect inferior to the Greek more ſtill than in ſound—particularly in the verb.—Examples of the defect of the Latin language in that part of ſpeech —inferior even to the Engliſh.—Defective alſo in participles.—The Latins want alſo the variety of two aoriſts and three futures.—Defective alſo in moods—wanting alſo a voice which the Greeks have in their verbs, and a dual number both in their verbs and their nouns.—The Latin wants one part of ſpeech wholly, viz. the article.—The conſequence of this defect is to make the expreſſion of the*

Ch. Pag.
language obſcure and ambiguous.— Examples of this. - 82

11. *Of Compoſition in Latin—not different in variety of arrangement from the Greek.—In ſome of the Latin poets greater variety of arrangement than in the Greek.--But in the proſe authors a tedious ſameneſs in the arrangement, by placing the verb laſt ſo often in the ſentence.—The want of particles, ſuch as the Greeks have, a great defect in the Latin compoſition.* 94

12. *The words of the modern Greek the ſame for the greater part with thoſe of the ancient—different in the pronunciation and grammar.—Of the ſound of the modern Greek—little variety in it.—Five letters ſounded the ſame way.—No* diphthongs *or* aſpirates—*no* melody *or* rhythm, *but only* accents, *ſuch as ours.—They retain ſomething of the grammatical art.—form ſome caſes and tenſes by flection —have genders and numbers in their*

Ch. Pag.

nouns, and perſons and numbers in their verbs—but their grammar cannot be reduced to any rule.—The Engliſh pronunciation of the ancient Greek very like to the pronunciation of the modern Greek—has all the faults that pronunciation can have—formerly it was ſtill worſe, as they neglected the quantity, and pronounced the accents as they do the accents in their own language.—A reformation may be made of the Engliſh pronunciation of the Greek, without much difficulty.—The advantage of the Scottiſh pronunciation.—The corruption and debaſement of the Greek language ſhould be a warning to other nations to preſerve their language, by the ſtudy of the grammatical art in the ancient languages. 97

13. *Of the* ſound *of the Engliſh language.—It conſiſts chiefly of monoſyllables.—The words crouded with conſonants, and many terminated with the aſpirated* t.*—This fault of the*

Ch. Pag.

language aggrated by modern uſe.—No melody *or* rhythm *in the Engliſh language.—The words and ſyllables, at the ſame time pronounced with a great variety of* tones; *but theſe not reduced to any rule.—The wonderful art of the Greek language in this reſpect.—Of* accents *in Engliſh.—They give a variety to the pronunciation of the language, and make our verſification more various and beautiful than that of other modern nations.—The abuſe of our modern accents in our modern uſe of them.—Not to be compared, though ever ſo properly uſed, to the rhythm of Greek and Latin.—The words in Engliſh conſidered as ſignificant.—In this reſpect, the language is ſtill more inferior to the Greek and Latin, particularly in the* verb.—*The time of it not expreſſed, except by one fleĉtion of the word; nor the* numbers *except in one inſtance.—Defective alſo in the expreſſion of* perſons.—*We had once a* mood *expreſſed by the termination;*

Ch. Pag.

but that is now loſt.—Only two participles *expreſſed by termination.—The Engliſh more defective ſtill in* voices, *than in tenſes or moods.—No* middle voice.—*And no tenſe, mood, or participle in the* paſſive voice, *expreſſed by flection.—The clumſy circumlocutions that we are obliged to uſe to ſupply the defects of the paſſive voice.—As to* nouns *in Engliſh, they have no genders nor caſes, and therefore may be reckoned indeclinable words.—The compoſition alſo of words very defective in Engliſh; and alſo the etymology, as it is not an original language.* - - - 110

14. *Of Engliſh compoſition of words in ſentences.—The defect of it compared with the Greek and Latin compoſition.—The want of variety of arrangement in it.—Examples of this from Horace's ode to Pyrrha, tranſlated by Milton.—Milton, in his proſe ſtile as well as verſe, has all the variety of arrangement that the language will*

Ch. Pag.

admit.—The preſent arrangement, like the French, in what is called the natural order.—Our compoſition cannot be ſufficiently diverſified, otherwiſe than by compoſition in periods.—Milton's Latin ſtile compoſed of very fine periods.—In his Engliſh proſe, the language does not permit him to vary his ſtile ſo much; very different, however, from the faſhionable ſtile at preſent.—An account of that ſtile.—It is of two different kinds, 128

15. *The French language inferior to the Engliſh in ſound, having neither accent nor quantity.—It is a fault in ſpeaking French to mark any accent.—They have no perceptible difference in the quantity of their ſyllables.—This makes their verſification very imperfect, compared with the Engliſh.—Their long verſe particularly, moſt tireſomely uniform.—The French words not ſo much crouded with conſonants as the Engliſh, but wanting*

Ch. Pag.

aſpirates too much.—The Grammar of the French language more complete than of ours, having much more flection,—but of this they do not avail themſelves in their compoſition at preſent; but did ſo formerly, particularly in their verſe. - - 135

16. *Of the Italian language.—The words of it long and full.—Of Vowels.—Few of their words terminated by Conſonants.—Their pronunciation therefore more flowing than either that of Engliſh or French.—They have accents ſuch as the Engliſh.—Make therefore poetry of blank verſe.—Have long and ſhort ſyllables, but no diphthongs, except one.—Their accents not ſo violent as thoſe in Engliſh,—do not obſcure the pronunciation of the other ſyllables.—It is a language better for muſic than any other now known.—The words not loſt in their muſic.—It is more reconcilable to the rhythm af the language, than the mu-*

Ch. Pag.

ſic even of the Greek Tragedy.—The grammar of their language more complete than that of the Engliſh, particularly in their verbs; but no declenſion of nouns.—This appears to be the moſt artificial part of language,—one part of ſpeech it has more than the Latin, viz. the Article,—has greater variety in its accents, and therefore in its poetry, than the Engliſh.—Some obſervations upon language in general, ariſing from the Italian language.—The tone of different languages diſtinct from the pronunciation of the letters or words.—Very difficult to be acquired by a foreigner, - - 144

17. *From the compariſon of languages in the preceding chapters, it is evident that the Greek and Latin are much ſuperior to the modern.—Theſe are barbarous in the proper ſenſe of the word.—The author, in this inquiry, has followed the ancient method of inveſtigating things.—The ad-*

Ch. Pag.

vantage to be got from the comparison of different languages.—Impossible that a man, who understands only one language, can know either its excellencies or defects.—Not having the same materials as the ancients, it is impossible we can compose so well.—All we can do, is to give as much variety as possible to our style.—This is to be done chiefly by composition in periods.—Numbers in our prose, not to be affected.—This the fault of some modern English writers.—Of the degeneracy of all languages, the originals of which we know.—The degeneracy most remarkable of the Greek language.—The degeneracy of the English language in modern times, both in sound *and* signification *of the words.—Example of this last.—Reason why the author has insisted so much upon the* sound *of the languages he has compared.*—Written language not spoken, *may be called a* dead language, *where as what* is spoken, *is a* living language.—*The de-*

Ch. Pag.

generacy of language and other neceſſary arts of life, cannot be accounted for otherwiſe than by a degeneracy of the people.—The want of an ear and voice for muſic, makes the northern nations incapable of pronouncing as the ancient Greeks did.—Of the great difficulty of the invention of language, both as to the matter *and the* form.—*The* matter *of language not furniſhed, as that of other arts, by Nature, but by man himſelf.—Of the defect of the pronunciation even of vowels, in ſundry nations.—The* form *of language ſtill more difficult than the* material *part of it.—Wonderful inventions for expreſſing the infinity of things, by a limited number of words.—Language of ſo difficult invention, that it would not have been invented by men, without ſupernatural aſſiſtance; but, being invented, it might be cultivated and improved without ſuch aſſiſtance.—Even for this certain things neceſſary which are not to be found in this age.—The practice of*

Ch. Pag.
language, after it is invented, different from the practice of other arts, 159

BOOK II.

Of Stile, and its Different Kinds.

Ch. Pag.
1. Public ſpeaking *an art—alſo* private converſation.—Writing *an art likewiſe.—The beſt orations could not pleaſe, if they were not firſt well written.—The art of writing different, according to the different ſubjects.—In writing upon certain ſciences, ſuch as mathematics, no art of ſtile is required.—Of the nature of that ſtudy, and how much it engroſſes a man,* - - 189

Ch. Pag.

2. *Writing, being an art, muſt be either invented or learned.—Was not invented among the northern nations, any more than any other liberal art.—Muſt be learned from the Greeks, as well as ſtatuary and painting.—Good writing more difficult than either of theſe arts.—The compariſon of them with the writing art, both as to the ſubject and the materials.—The beſt models of the writing art ſtill extant - - 197*

3. Variety *the great beauty of ſtile, as well as of language.—Of the variety of ſingle words.—There may be too great variety of theſe.—Examples of authors who exceed in that way, ſuch as Plato, Cicero, and Lord Shafteſbury.—Demoſthenes a model in that reſpect, as well as in others;—alſo Horace.—The rule to be followed in this matter, - - 205*

4. *Of the compoſition of words.—Of the variety, which the* rhythms *and* ac-

Ch. Pag.
cents *of the Greek language gave to their pronunciation.—Thoſe were a beauty of their proſe, as well as of their verſe compoſition.—No* melody *or* rhythm *in the pronunciation of Engliſh.—We have only what we call* accents.*—Theſe meaſure our verſe but not our proſe.—The French have neither* quantity *nor* accent.*—The Italians have* accents.*—The modern Greeks have* accents *ſuch as ours.—We want one of the greateſt beauties of ancient compoſition, variety of arrangement of words.—Not eaſy to ſet bounds to that variety in the ancient languages.—That arrangement not ſo artificial in their converſation, and in their laws and decrees; very artificial in their poetry.—Examples of this from Horace's odes.—Not ſo much of it in his ſatires and epiſtles.—Virgil's verſification diſtinguiſhed in this way;—too much of it in him;—leſs of it in Homer, except in his ſimilies.—Of the figure* Hyperbaton, *and of the difficulty of defining it.—Of the*

Ch. Pag.

ſingularity of the Latin arrangement of words, concluding the ſentence ſo often with the verb:—Difference in this reſpect betwixt the Greek and Latin compoſition.—The only way of varying the ſtile of modern languages is by compoſition in periods.—Thoſe who do not think periods beautiful, do not know what beauty is.—The diſadvantages of compoſing in ſhort ſentences:—Weakens the comprehenſion of the hearers or readers:—Makes them unable to ſpeak or read ſuch compoſition.—The taſte and the facility of compoſing in that way, only to be acquired by the ſtudy of the ancient authors, particularly Demoſthenes.—A great orator in England formed by reciting his orations. - 211

5. *The beauty of the Greek compoſition perceived even by the people.—Of the difference betwixt a learned and an unlearned judge, in the matter of oratory and of popular writing.—The art of compoſition beſt learned from*

Ch. Pag.

Dionyſius the Halicarnaſſian;—he divides the art into two branches, the choice of the words, and the joining them properly together.—This laſt, the moſt difficult of the two.—Two things required to make fine compoſition, that it ſhould be pleaſant, and that it ſhould be beautiful.—Theſe muſt depend upon the elements of ſpeech properly joined together.—Of the letters, the ſyllables, and the words in Greek.—Of the changes which their orators made upon their words.—The compoſition of words into periods, of great variety and beauty.—Four things required to make fine compoſition, melody, rhythm, varietv, *and what is ſuitable or proper to the ſubject.—Of the melody of the Greek language.—Different tones upon different words in other languages as well as the Greek, but not regulated by art.—Of the* rhythm *in Greek.—Shown that there is a rhythm in the proſe as well as the verſe.—A difference of*

Ch. Pag.

rhythms ſuited to different ſtiles in proſe.—Of the difference betwixt the rhythm of verſe and of proſe.—The mind much affected by rhythm as well as by other kinds of motion.—The greateſt excellence of proſe is to reſemble verſe, and of verſe to reſemble proſe.—This explained —Proſe reſembles verſe by rhythm,—but it muſt not be the rhythm of verſe.—Examples given in the Greek Lyric poetry, of rhythms that do not appear to be regular or meaſured.—Examples of ſuch rhythms in Demoſthenes.—That there are ſuch rhythms in proſe, atteſted by Ariſtotle as well as by the Halicarnaſſian.—Of poetry in Engliſh in which the verſe is concealed.—Of proſe in Engliſh reſembling verſe.—How verſe is made to reſemble proſe.—Examples of this from Homer and from Milton.—Of variety in the proſe ſtile.—That abſolutely neceſſary to make it pleaſant.—There muſt be a variety not only in the words, but of the rhythms *and the* melody.—*Lit-*

Ch. Pag.

tle variety at preſent in our Engliſh proſe.—Milton imitates the ancients in this as in other things.—Opinions of certain critics in the days of the Halicarnaſſian, that Demoſthenes did not labour his words ſo much as the Halicarnaſſian ſuppoſes.—Anſwer to this objection.—The writing of numerous proſe, *though difficult at firſt, becomes eaſy by practice.—Examples of this from other arts.—The art of fine ſpeaking and writing more difficult than the other arts;—requires greater labour to excell in it.—A great memory neceſſarily required in an ancient orator.—An art of memory among them, unknown in modern times.—The nature of this art.—If the moderns excell or equal the ancients in oratory, it muſt be by ſuperiority of genius,—Commendation of the Halicarnaſſian's writings.* - 246

6. *In judging of what is proper in writing, the ſubject only to be conſidered.* —Stile, *divided according to the ſub-*

Ch. Pag.

ject, is of six kinds,—1. Epistolary stile, *should be concise, and without any thing like composition in periods.* —*The ancients excelled in that kind of writing as well as in every other.* —2. Dialogue writing,—*That nothing else but conversation written,* —*Of the stile of conversation,—few excell in it.—Bodily qualities necessary for that excellence.—Some so deficient in these, that it is impossible they can converse agreeably.*—Speaking *and* moving *distinguish a gentleman and lady more than any thing else.—Both studied more in France than in Britain.—Defects of pronunciation in private conversation may be corrected.—Of the fault of too fast speaking.—Of the contrary extreme.* —*Of speaking too slow and with an affected gravity.—Of too strong emphasis in speaking.—Too much study to speak well must not be shown in private conversation.—Provincial and professional dialects to be avoided.—Verses well repeated, an ornament of*

Ch. Pag.

converſation.—Of politeneſs in converſation;—four things required in order to be polite, - - 289

6. Dialogue writing *is converſation upon the ſubject of ſome art or ſcience.—Not a mere catechiſm, but of the poetic kind, having a fable with characters and manners;—not therefore real converſation, ſuch as the Socratic converſations recorded by Xenophon.—Plato the great dialogiſt of antiquity.—His dialogues fictions even as to the* matter.*—Some of them admirable pieces of poetry;—but he does not ſucceed when he delivers whole ſyſtems of ſcience in that way.—Ariſtotle's manner in ſuch works much better.—The ſtile of dialogue ſhould be ſimple.—Plato's ſtile not ſo in ſome of his dialogues.—A poetical arrangement of the words affected by him.—Cicero the next great dialogiſt of antiquity;—his manner quite different from Plato's:—Wherein that difference conſiſts.—His ſtile alſo very*

Ch. Pag.

different from Plato's;—great variety of matter in his philoſophical dialogues.—The ſect of philoſophy, to which he was addicted, furniſhed arguments upon both ſides of a queſtion.—They are full alſo of examples from both Greek and Roman hiſtory.—The rhetoric of them better than of his orations,—his dialogues on the ſubject of eloquence, and in general his writings upon eloquence, the beſt part of his works.—Eloquence the delight and ſtudy of his life;—philoſophy he only applied to when he could do nothing better.—Nothing therefore new or excellent in his philoſophical works;—but his rhetorical, admirable of the kind.—Only two rhetorical dialogues;—of theſe the one De Oratore, *the beſt thing that ever Cicero wrote;—it is perfect of the kind, having both fable and characters:—The perſonages in this dialogue;—not all the ſame the ſecond day that they were the firſt:—The difference accounted for:—The time and place of the dia-*

Ch. Pag.

logues marked:—The endurance of it alſo:—That more conſiſtent with probability, than the length of ſome of Plato's diſputations:—It is divided into two days.—The diſputation of the firſt contained in Cicero's firſt *book.—The ſubject of that diſputation.—The ſecond day's diſputation divided into two converſations; the one in the forenoon, the other in the afternoon.—The forenoon's converſation contained in the ſecond book.*—Antonius *the ſpeaker there, who goes thro' all the ſubject matter:—The narration is agreeably diverſified by one of the perſonages explaining that part of eloquence, which conſiſts in pleaſantry and facetiouſneſs.—The* third *converſation in the afternoon of the ſecond day.—This contained in Cicero's third book.—The ſcene of it changed.* Craſſus *the chief ſpeaker there, who explains all the ornaments of ſpeech.—The exordium of this third book very fine, and very pathetical, giving an account of the calamities,*

Ch. Page

which after that befel the commonwealth, and in which moſt of the ſpeakers in that dialogue periſhed.—Of the grand idea of an orator which Craſſus had.—It comprehends, according to him, the knowledge of arts and ſciences.—In ancient times, the knowledge of things and words was not divided.—This diviſion firſt made in the ſchools of philoſophers.—Anſwer to the objection that it is impoſſible to learn ſo many things.—A pauſe after this in the converſation, which is interrupted by Cotta putting Craſſus in mind of the province he had undertaken, which was to explain the manner *of an oration, as Antonius had done the* matter;—*Craſſus accordingly explains the ornaments of ſingle words;—of words in compoſition;—of rhythms;—of what is* decent *and* proper; *and,* laſtly, *of* pronunciation *and* accent.—*Cicero concludes the dialogue, with a compliment to his friend Hortenſius from the mouth of Craſſus.—Of the* decorum

Ch. Pag.

obſerved in this laſt day's converſation with reſpect to thoſe who ſpeak. —The ſpeech of Craſſus the moſt laboured part of the dialogue.—Cicero there gives his own idea of the perfect orator.—That idea a true idea; —without that univerſal knowledge, an orator cannot be rich in the ornaments of ſpeech, nor have that elevation of mind neceſſary for a great ſpeaker.—He cannot be ſuch a ſpeaker as Pericles.—The dialogue upon the whole the fineſt part of Cicero's works. —Of his treatiſe De Senectute, *—not a dialogue, but a moſt pleaſant little compoſition.—A tranſlation of it into Greek by Theodorus Gaza.—Another little treatiſe of Cicero* upon Friendſhip.—*That comes nearer dialogue than the former.—Some general obſervations upon Cicero's dialogues.— Cicero more happy in the choice of the perſonages of his dialogues than Plato.—Alſo much greater politeneſs in Cicero's dialogues than in Plato's.*

Ch. Pag.

—The beſt ſchool of politeneſs to be found, is in Cicero's dialogues.—Cicero's dedication of his works to ſome friend, much to be approved of.—Thoſe dedications ſhow, that he had a heart capable of friendſhip.—The advantages of philoſophy, friendſhip, and the ſociety of ſuch men as he lived with in thoſe days, and in theſe, 304

8. *Of Lord Shafteſbury's dialogue, entitled* The Moraliſts;*—this a complete dramatical piece in all its parts;—better divided as to time, than ſome dialogues of Plato.—Of the different characters in it.—The firſt day's converſation a proper introduction to what is principal in the piece, viz. the converſion of a ſceptic to theiſm.—The ſecond day's converſation is divided into four parts:—The firſt is of Philocles with Theocles in the morning, alone;—the ſecond at dinner, when two new characters are introduced;—The third is in the fields, when Theocles, in a long diſ-*

Ch. Pag.

courſe, demonſtrates the exiſtence of God from his works.—Here the cataſtrophe of the piece begins.—The ſequel of this converſation contains conſequences from what had been before demonſtrated.—The fourth converſation of the ſecond day is upon the ſubject of miracles and prodigies.—This converſation agreeably varied with reſpect to the ſpeakers as well as the ſubject.—Of the third day's converſation of Philocles with Theocles alone.—The ſcene the ſame as where they met the firſt day.—Of the Rhapſodies of Theocles in this converſation, and the ſtile of them;—not incredible to thoſe who have heard the Italian rhapſodiſts.—Subject of the firſt rhapſody is an invocation of Divinity;—*of the* ſecond, *a deſcription of that vivifying power, which pervades all Nature;—the* third *has for its ſubject the elements and minerals;—the* fourth *contains a deſcription of the different countries of the earth, and the various appearances of Nature in*

Ch. Pag.

them.—Betwixt ſome of the Rhapſodies, a great deal of cool reaſoning and dialogue in the Socratic way of queſtion and anſwer is interſperſed.—Concluſion of the work ſuitable to the main deſign of it;—contains, 1mo, *An account of Beauty, and the ſeveral kinds of it;—ſhows that all beauty is reſolvable into the Supreme Beauty of the Firſt Being.—Beauty produces admiration, and admiration enthuſiaſm.—Of the ſeveral kinds of enthuſiaſm. The ſenſe of beauty ſhown to be innate in man, and not acquired.—*2do, *The concluſion alſo ſhows the neceſſity of philoſophiſing; and that, in fact, every man does philoſophiſe more or leſs.—Obſervations upon this dialogue:—The fable of it excellent, with greater variety than in Cicero's dialogue* De Oratore *:—The ſtile ſuch as might be expected from a man like Lord Shafteſbury:—Politeneſs too, ſuch as in Cicero's dialogues.—Obſervations on the philoſophy of this piece.—The love, of which beauty is the*

Ch. Pag.

object, made a fundamental principle both of virtue and religion.—This philoſophy perfectly agreeable to Scripture.—From the ſame principle, Shafteſbury demonſtrates the Being and Attributes of God.—This demonſtration better than any demonſtration of the ſame a priori.—*Dr Clarke's demonſtration examined, and ſhown not to be ſo complete as that of Shafteſbury.—Shafteſbury's philoſophy, however, not perfect in this dialogue.—The diſtinction betwixt the animal and intellectual parts of our nature, not explicitly laid down.—The conſequences of this diſtinction;—it demonſtrates the beautiful to be good;—puts an end to the paradox of the Stoics concerning virtue;—their language more proper than that of the other philoſophers.—Praiſe of Lord Shafteſbury's writings.—They are now out of faſhion.—That the fate of other writings, which deſerve it as little.—Of Mr Harris's dialogues upon* art *and* happineſs,—*not properly* dialogues, *according to my definition.*

Ch. Pag.

—*They have, however, great merit, as all the writings of that author have,* - - 341

9. *Of the ſtile of* Hiſtory.—*Of the difference betwixt* Hiſtory *and* Biography.—*The ſubject of hiſtory is narrative.—Whatever is not narrative in hiſtory is epiſodical.—What epiſodes are proper for hiſtory,—not political or philoſophical reflections upon human nature, ſuch as thoſe of Salluſt in the beginning of* Cataline's conſpiracy, *and of the* Jugurthine war.—*Explanation of particular cuſtoms and manners of a nation, a proper epiſode in hiſtory.—Difference in this reſpect betwixt the Greek hiſtorians of Roman affairs, and their own.—Of the* rhetorical ſtile *in hiſtory.*—Speeches *in it, not digreſſions or epiſodes but matters of fact and parts of the ſtory.—Speeches make political and philoſophical reflections not improper in hiſtory.—Hiſtory therefore a moſt pleaſant and various compoſition;—but the* poetical *ſtile, a variety which hiſtory*

Ch. Pag.

does not admit.—Of the peculiarities of the poetical ſtile which hiſtory does not admit, ſuch as Epithets, Similes, Metaphors, *and* Minute Deſcriptions. *—Of the* painting *in Homer, and the difference in that reſpect betwixt his ſtile, and the ſtile of hiſtory.—Of the choice of words in the hiſtorical ſtile. —Difference, in that reſpect, betwixt the ſtile of Homer and of hiſtory.—Of the* Compoſition *in hiſtory, by which the ſtile of it is chiefly to be diſtinguiſhed from common ſpeech;—not to be diſtinguiſhed in that way by* variety of arrangement, *as in Greek and Latin, but only by* Periods.—*Of the great beauty of* Periods.—*Quotation upon that ſubject from Ariſtotle, ſhowing, that he thought there could be no beauty, without a* Syſtem *and a* Whole.—*There is nothing that can be properly called* Compoſition *without periods.—Of the defect of Salluſt and Tacitus in this reſpect.—The ſtile of Tacitus worſe than that of Salluſt. —One example of a Greek author,*

Ch. Pag.

who writes like Salluſt.—Such compoſitions ſtill more inexcuſable in Greek than in Latin. - - 395

10. *The hiſtory of Herodotus moſt various both in matter and ſtile.—The matter takes in the whole hiſtory of the world, as far as it was known, before his time.—Yet there is an unity in his work, ſuch as there is in Homer's poems.—He begins his work, as Homer does, with the cauſe of the wars betwixt the Greeks and Barbarians, which are the ſubject of his work.—Other things he has introduced as epiſodes.—Of the truth of the facts in Herodotus.—Theſe not credible to a man, who believes that men have always been the ſame in all ages and nations.—No lies in Herodotus.—Of the variety of his ſtile.—Not poetical, though like the ſtile of Homer;—very much figured, and yet neither rhetorical nor poetical.—It is compoſed in periods, but not rhetorical periods.—Examples of the period*

Ch. Pag.

in Herodotus.—Cicero miſtaken in ſaying, that there are no numbers in Herodotus.—Of the ſpeeches in Herodotus;—there are but few, but theſe upon proper occaſions;—the matter of them excellent.—Not many reflections, nor philoſophical and political obſervations; but theſe to the purpoſe.—One example of them.—The dialect, in which he writes, Ionic.—He uſes much the terminations of the datives plural in that dialect.—No epithets, ſimiles, or pictureſque deſcriptions in his ſtile, nor any of the ſtrong figures uſed by Homer.—One figure of Homer, much uſed by him, viz. dialogue.—Examples of Herodotus's dialogue.—His ſtile diſtinguiſhed in that way from that of every other hiſtorian.—Herodotus a religious hiſtorian.—All hiſtorians, as well as poets of the higher order, ought to be religious.—Herodotus not ſuperſtitious, or over credulous, in matters of religion, - 414

ERRATA.

P. 65. l. 20. and 21.	For *German Profeſſor Hoegenville*, Read *Dutch Profeſſor Hoogeveen.*
—231.—26.	For *for the Greek*, Read *for the Greeks.*
—293.—18.	For *in the 10th book*, Read *in the 9th.*
———	For *Epiſt.* 9. Read *Epiſt.* 16.

PREFACE.

I Here preſent to the public the fourth volume OF THE ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF LANGUAGE; and, in order to accompliſh my plan, I have promiſed a fifth. The reader will perceive, that in this and the preceding volumes of this work, and indeed in all that I have written, whether upon the ſubject of Language or Philoſophy, I have made much uſe of that great art, the greateſt of all arts, as Cicero ſays, by which we are taught *rem univerſam in partes tribuere, latentem definiendo explicare.* If therefore the reader be a man, who has never applied to any art or ſcience, or, if he think that he has genius and natural parts ſufficient to comprehend any art or ſcience without ſuch accurate definitions and minute diviſions, he needs not give himſelf the trouble to read this work, or any other that I have publiſhed,

or ſhall publiſh; for by the ſtudy of the ancient philoſophy I have got ſo much into the habit of treating every thing as a ſcience, or ſyſtem, that I can think, ſpeak, or write, of no ſubject of art or ſcience but in that way. He may therefore amuſe himſelf by reading compilements of ancient or modern hiſtory, collections of facts of natural hiſtory, or ſome things upon the ſubjects of art or ſcience, under the modeſt name of *Eſſays*; in which the authors think themſelves confined to no order or method, but ſet down at a venture ſome looſe thoughts that occur to them upon the ſubject.

Another thing the reader will obſerve, that I extol the ancient languages and literature above the modern; and maintain, that the works of the ancients muſt be our ſtandard in the writing art, as well as in ſculpture, painting, and architecture. Whoever therefore thinks that

Venimus ad ſummum fortunae,———

which, as Horace tells us, was the caſe of the Romans under Auguſtus Caeſar, and

that we have attained to the perfection of all arts*, him I would likewiſe adviſe not to read this work: For there are things in it which may ſtumble him in his opinion of the excellency of this age; and, as every man partakes more or leſs of the glory of the age in which he lives, and he may perhaps think that he has a large ſhare of it, this work muſt have a tendency to leſſen him in his own opinion, which I ſhould be ſorry for; for, as I have ſaid elſewhere †, though I deſire the praiſe of very few, I would not willingly give offence to any. He may therefore take the word of the reviewers, and believe the work to be of no value ‡.

* See what I have ſaid of the vanity of this age, Ant. Metaph. Vol. iii. p. 107.

† Preface to Vol. iii. of this work, p. 15.

‡ There is one of theſe writers, who, in the review of the ſecond volume, as I remember, of this work, after finding a great many particular faults with the work, concludes with ſaying, that he knows very well the author will have no regard to his cenſures, tho' he thinks it a duty he owes to the public to let them know that the work is of no value. This, I take, as a great

It may appear ſurpriſing, that an author, who publiſhes a work, ſhould not deſire as many readers as poſſible, but, on the contrary, ſhould adviſe ſome perſons not to read it. But, I do not write for profit; and as to reputation, I deſire the applauſe of none but men of ſenſe, knowledge, and good taſte; for, I think, I am pretty free of that diſeaſe, which Mr Pope calls the *itch of vulgar praiſe*. Excepting therefore thoſe few I have named, (for they muſt be few in every nation), I value the praiſe of the reſt of mankind as little as their cenſure: And, if I had my choice, I would not wiſh to be praiſed by them, but rather cenſured; as people very ſeldom praiſe thoſe whom they do not think like to themſelves. Though I print therefore, it is not ſo much for the ſake of publiſhing, as for the purpoſe of collecting and digeſting what I have had lying by me for many years in looſe ſheets, which would have been loſt even to myſelf, if I had not

compliment; and, if I knew who the reviewer was, I would give him more than I would have given him, if I had hired him to praiſe the work.

employed a printer to give me them in a fair character and good order *, and with ſuch corrections and additions, as upon a ſecond reading occur to me. I have, however, alſo made copies for the uſe of my friends; and, if others can be benefited by my works, there are copies alſo for them.

There is one other thing in this volume, which I would recommend to the attention of the reader; and that is the abuſes which I have obſerved are creeping into the Engliſh language †. It is, I think, upon the whole, the beſt modern language, at leaſt that I know; and, particularly, there is ſome of our poetry without the jingle of rhyme, or in blank verſe, as we call it, which does more honour to modern times than any thing of the kind I know. Whatever, therefore, we have loſt, or may further loſe, I would have us preſerve, if poſ-

* See the Preface to Vol. iii. of Ant. Metaph. p. 79. and 80.

† See upon the ſubject of the Engliſh language, book i. chap. 13. and 14.

ſible, our language; for, as all arts and ſciences began with language, ſo the corruption of language muſt neceſſarily be attended with a degeneracy in theſe. In the Greek nation we have a ſad example of a people, who ſpoke the fineſt language that ever exiſted, and excelled mankind in arts *, loſing with their language all thoſe arts, and returning to a ſtate of barbarity, much worſe than the firſt barbarity, from which by arts and civility they were reclaimed. For Savages are ſtrong of body and mind, and therefore are capable of the higheſt cultivation, and may be truly ſaid to be the creatures of God and Nature; whereas, thoſe, who have degenerated into a ſtate of barbarity from a ſtate of civility and refined manners, are in a ſtate altogether unnatural, being ſo worn out by indolence and luxury, vice and diſeaſe, that they have not in them the materials, out of which the *human artiſts* of ancient times made men; and, therefore, there is no example, nor will there ever

* See on the ſubject of the modern Greek language, chap. 12.

be, of any nation, ſuch as the Greek, recovering its ancient ſplendor.

There are, I know, who will think what I have ſaid in the beginning of this volume, upon the ſubject of the elements of the grammatical art, I mean letters and ſyllables, trifling and frivolous, But for my part, the more I ſtudy language, the more I admire the art of it *, which cannot be underſtood, unleſs we know its elements and principles. It appears to the philoſopher the moſt wonderful of all arts; nor does he think it the leſs wonderful, but rather more ſo, for being the art of moſt common uſe. One of the nobleſt ſtudies of man is the hiſtory and philoſophy of man. Now, I hold it to be impoſſible to know perfectly what man is, without knowing the nature of that art, the foundation of the civil and political life, and of all other arts and ſciences, without which, man muſt have remained in the brute ſtate, in which we know ſome

* See what I have ſaid of the difficulty of the art, p. 49.—182. and following.

men were in ancient times, and ſome are ſtill to be found. It is chiefly by means of language that man is ſo far recovered from his fallen ſtate, as to be an intellectual creature, not only capable of intellect, but in the actual poſſeſſion of it; for, that man is fallen from a higher ſtate, I hold to be a truth of philoſophy, as well as of religion, and will ſhew it to be ſo, if I ſhall live to finiſh the great work I have begun, THE HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF MAN.

OF THE

ORIGIN AND PROGRESS

OF

LANGUAGE.

VOL. IV. BOOK I.

Of the different Excellencies and Defects of different Languages.

INTRODUCTION.

AS there can be no work of art perfect, of which the materials are not of the beſt kind, and language being the materials whereof ſtyle is compoſed, it may not be an improper ſupplement to

what I have written on the ſubject of Stile, to preſent to the reader a comparative view of ſome languages, both antient and modern, in point of beauty and excellence, from whence he will be able to judge in what language, and for what reaſons, the beſt compoſition, both in ſpeaking and writing, may be made. He will alſo perceive how far in the rude and more imperfect languages the compoſition may be improved by imitation of languages more perfect.

Before I ſpeak of particular languages, I will lay down the general and abſtract principles by which we are to judge of the excellency of language, and then I will apply theſe principles to ſome particular languages.

Language being the expreſſion of the ideas of the human mind by articulate ſounds or words, it will be fully conſidered under two general heads, the ſound of theſe words, and the ſenſe of them; or, to expreſs it in philoſophical language, the ma-

terial and the formal part *. I will begin with the firſt.

* See this philoſophical diviſion of language explained in Vol. i. of this Work, page. 8. ſecond edition, and Vol. ii. p. 23.

CHAP. I.

No beauty in any art without variety.—There muſt, therefore, in a perfect language, be a great variety of ſounds.—The variety of the ſound in the termination particularly to be attended to.—Defect of the antient Perſian language in this reſpect.—Defect of the languages of the South Sea in point of variety of ſound.—A perfect language muſt be ſweet in the ſound, as well as various, but not too ſweet of ſound.—The barbarous languages defective in this, being too vocal.—The words muſt not be too ſhort.—The Barbarous languages go to another extreme.—The ſound of a language much raiſed by the uſe of diphthongs.—The Barbarous languages defective in this.—The difference of ſpirits *in pronunciation makes an agreeable variety.—This the Barbarous languages have.—The quantity of ſyllables, or the* rhythm, *makes another variety.—This ſome of the Barbarous languages have.*

—Of the melody of language.—Some languages of Savage nations have melody.

AS there can be no beauty in any art without variety, (for art is a ſyſtem, and there can be no ſyſtem without variety, as well as order and regularity), the firſt thing I require to make a language beautiful is, that it ſhould have a variety of articulate ſounds *. Without variety to a certain degree, it would not anſwer the purpoſe of expreſſing all our conceptions even in the narroweſt ſphere of life; but I require further, that a perfect language ſhould have all the variety of ſounds that the human mouth can, with any degree of eaſe and without grimace or diſtortion, utter; and, particularly, there ſhould be a great variety in the termination of the words; that being the part of the word which in pronunciation affects the ear moſt. And I think there could not well be a greater defect in the ſound of a language than what Herodotus obſerves of

* See what I have ſaid of the four things required to make a perfect language, Vol. ii. of this work, p. 6.

the Perſian, that it terminated all its words with the ſame letter, *S* *. It would, I think, have been a great defect, if the letter *S* had been of the moſt pleaſant ſound: Whereas, the Halicarnaſſian ſays of it, that its ſound is more brutal than human; for which reaſon, the antients uſed it very ſparingly. And he ſays there were whole odes compoſed without one Σ in them †. And this, no doubt, is the reaſon that it is thrown out in many Greek words, when the analogy requires that it ſhould be there.

The want of this variety is ſeen in almoſt all the Barbarous languages, which are very defective, particularly in conſonants; (for, as to the five vowels, it appears that all languages have them ‡). The Barbarous languages of North America have neither the *V* conſonant nor the *F*. The Huron language wants all

* Lib. i. Cap. 139.

† Περὶ συνθέσεως. Sect. 14.

‡ Vol. i. of this work, p. 502. of the ſecond edition, where I think I have given a good reaſon why the firſt languages ſpoken by men are ſo vocal.

the labial conſonants *; and it is for this reaſon, that all thoſe languages of North America are much more vocal than more perfect languages, and have words conconſiſting wholly of vowels †. The languages of the South Sea are in the ſame caſe. To ſupply this defect of articulation, ſuch languages are forced, in order to diſtinguiſh their words from one another, to repeat the ſame letters and ſyllables, ſometimes more than once in the ſame words ‡.

The *ſecond* thing I require is, that the ſound of the language ſhould be ſweet and pleaſant to the ear. But here again that great beauty of all the works of art, I mean variety, muſt not be forgot. For, as in the fineſt muſic there muſt be diſcords, ſo in the moſt perfect languages there muſt be ſome harſh ſounds; but theſe may be ſo mixed with ſweet and ſoft ſounds, that the ſound of the language ſhall be upon the whole ſweet, but not of a ſweetneſs that is luſcious or cloying, but with ſuch a mixture of

* Ibid. p. 560.

† Ibid. p. 506. and following.

‡ Ibid. p. 501.—508.

auſtere and rough ſounds, as to make it manly and forcible, as well as pleaſant. In this point alſo the Barbarous languages are defective, for they are much too vocal for the reaſon above mentioned, having a great many vowels in their words, and often, as I have obſerved, repeating the ſame vowels, and wanting almoſt altogether the aſpirated conſonants.

3tio, I require that the words ſhould not be too ſhort, but, for the greater part by far, words of ſeveral ſyllables. For a language all of monoſyllables, ſuch as the Chineſe, or with very many monoſyllables, ſuch as ours, can never have a ſweet or pleaſant flow, as there muſt neceſſarily be a ſtop, more or leſs, betwixt every two words. Here the Barbarous languages go to another extreme, for the words of them are unmeaſureably long, for a reaſon I have given elſewhere *; to which may be added, that I believe the want of an articulation ſufficiently varied may have obliged them to lengthen their words, in order to diſtinguiſh them one from another.

* Vol. i. p. 500. ſecond edition.

4*to*. In order to ſwell and raiſe the ſound of the language, vowels, that will coaleſce together in the ſame ſound, ought to be joined and enunciated together, producing what we call diphthongs, which I think may not be improperly compared to what the antients called ſymphony and we call harmony, that is, muſic in parts, in which, by the mixture of the grave and acute joined properly together, the note is ſwelled, and made much more pleaſant to the ear. Theſe double ſounds may be alſo ſometimes ſeparated in the pronunciation, which will make an agreeable variety. And conſonants may be alſo joined together, and ſeparated ſometimes for the ſame reaſon. In this point, the Barbarous languages are as defective as they are exceſſive in the other.

5*to*, Some vowels and ſyllables ſhould be uttered with the breath thickened or condenſed, while others are pronounced more ſmoothly, and with leſs force. This makes the difference of what is called the two *ſpirits*; the one being *aſpirated* or thickened, as the Greeks call it, the other ſof-

tened or ſmoothed *. This is carefully to be diſtinguiſhed from *loud* or *low* in pronouncing letters or ſyllables. Many, indeed I believe all the barbarous languages, have this variety of ſpirits.

6*to*, Some of the vowels and ſyllables which they form ſhould be pronounced ſhort, others long. This is a moſt natural, as well as moſt agreeable variety, and is what is called the ryth̃m of language, being a certain ratio which the ear perceives betwixt ſhort and long ſounds. This too is very well known in ſome of the barbarous languages †.

* It is to be obſerved, that the word *aſpirated* does not properly expreſs what the Greeks call δασυς; for it ſeems to denote that the ſound is made rough or harſh; whereas it is only enunciated with more breath: And the Greek grammarians have been ſo accurate, as to obſerve that there is a middle claſs of conſonants betwixt the δασεις and the ψιλοι or *tenues*, which are enunciated with a breath not ſo much thickened or condenſed as when we pronounce the δασεις, or not ſo ſlender or gentle as that with which the ψιλοι are enunciated. See Vol. ii. p. 234. 235.

† See Vol. i. of this Work, p. 509. ſecond edition.

Laſtly, In a perfect language, there ſhould be melody as well as rhythm; that is to ſay, the ſyllables ſhould be varied and diſtinguiſhed from one another by certain muſical tones, with which they are pronounced. Of this I have treated fully in the Second Volume of this Work *. I ſhall only add here, that, though I believe there was melody originally in all or the greater part of languages, it is loſt in all the European, but is preſerved in ſome of the Barbarous languages ſpoken by certain tribes of Savages in North America, as I was well informed by a gentleman who was long there; and the Chineſe, by giving different tones to the ſame monoſyllable, make it ſignify ſeven or eight different things.

This is all the variety I can conceive in the ſounds of ſingle words. What further variety may be produced in their ſound by compoſition will be afterwards obſerved.

* Book ii. chap. 4.

CHAP. II.

Words conſidered as ſignificant.—In a language of art there muſt be of them a ſufficient number to expreſs all the variety of things.—Defect of Barbarous languages in this reſpect.—There muſt not be a redundancy, any more than a defect of words.—This prevented by that art of language we call flection.—*In this the Barbarous languages very defective.—The words of the language ſhould convey the meaning fully and accurately—alſo without obſcurity or ambiguity.—In both theſe articles Barbarous languages are defective.—They ſupply the defect by tones of the voice.—Words, that have a connection in their meaning, connected together in their ſound by* derivation *and* compoſition.—*The Barbarous languages want this art.—The want of words ſupplied by* metaphors *and other tropes.—In this the Barbarous languages are not deficient,—but moſt deficient of all in* ſyntax.—*Rea-*

ſons for this.—All languages ſpoken by barbarous nations are not barbarous.

I come now to ſpeak of words as ſignificant, firſt conſidering them ſingle, and then in compoſition.

As to ſingle words, there muſt be ſo many of them as to expreſs all the variety of things; and, as things are divided into certain claſſes, ſo are words. The diviſion of things was made by the antient philoſophers into certain claſſes, called Categories, which I hold to be the ground-work of grammar, as well as of logic; and, accordingly, that diviſion of words, which we call the parts of ſpeech, takes in all the categories; the firſt part of ſpeech, or the Noun, anſwering to the firſt Category, Subſtance; and the other parts of ſpeech to the ſeveral Accidents of things comprehended under the other Categories.

In this manner, ſubſtances, and all their ſeveral qualities, are expreſſed, and in ſhort all the variety of things. How defective the barbarous languages are in this reſpect,

I have ſhown in the Firſt Volume of this Work *.

2*do*, As a perfect language muſt be full and complete in words ſignificant, ſo it muſt not be redundant, nor expreſs by ſeveral words what can be expreſſed by one with ſome variations made upon it. For example, if certain accidents, or relations of words to one another, can be expreſſed by a change made upon the word, it would be ſuperfluous and a defect in the language, if a new word was employed to expreſs that accident or relation. The change made upon the word for that purpoſe is what we call *flection* or *inflection*; by which the caſes of nouns, and tenſes of verbs, are formed. But, as ſome words, by their nature, do not admit of ſuch variation, hence comes a a diſtinction of great importance in language, into words declinable and indeclinable. In flection, the barbarous lan-

* Book iii. Chap. 9. where I have obſerved, that there are ſome of them which have not any adjective, nor any word denoting a quality abſtracted from the ſubject. See alſo page 534. of the ſame Volume.

guages are more defective than in any thing elſe, few of them having any thing like caſes or tenſes; ſo that their words are all, or by far the greater part, indeclinable *. And this too muſt produce a diſagreeable ſameneſs in the ſound of thoſe languages; as, on the contrary, nothing varies the ſound of a language more than the different terminations, and different lengths of the words, which flexion produces.

3*tio*, In a language of art the words ſhould expreſs every circumſtance of the thing, and convey the meaning to the hearer as fully and accurately as poſſible.

But, 4*to*, There ſhould be no obſcurity or ambiguity in the words, otherwiſe the principal end of language cannot be anſwered, which is to convey the meaning to the hearer. In both theſe laſt articles the barbarous languages are very deficient,

* See Vol. i. Book iii. Chap. 9. of this Work, p. 532. ſecond edition.

and they ſupply the defect, as we are told, by accents, or tones of the voice *, and no doubt by geſtures, or action of the body.

5to, The variety of things being ſo great, that, if there were words entirely unconnected with one another to expreſs every particular thing, the language would be too bulky and cumberſome, and too great a load upon the memory; therefore the artificers of language have contrived a way of connecting words ſignifying things that have a connection, by the means of what is called derivation and compoſition: So that ſome words are radical, ſome derivative; ſome words are ſimple, and others compounded. In this too, the languages barbarous, that is, without art, are remarkably deficient; for they expreſs things having the neareſt connection by words quite different †.

And, *laſtly*, as, even with derivation and compoſition, words are wanted to expreſs many things, this neceſſity has introduced

* Vol. i. of this Work, p. 535. ſecond edition.

† Ibidem.

the uſe of metaphors and other tropes, which I am perſuaded were at firſt uſed from neceſſity; ſo that it was not till later times that they came to be uſed as an ornament of diſcourſe.—In this figurative ſtyle the barbarous languages abound exceedingly, more from want of proper words than for the ſake of ornament.

Although a language were ever ſo complete in its words, yet, if thoſe words are not properly put together, they will expreſs no meaning. This part of the grammatical art is called *ſyntax;* and it is the completion of the art of language. In this the barbarous languages are remarkably defective; for it is performed chiefly by the means of genders, numbers, and caſes, all which the barbarous languages want, and alſo by conjunctions and prepoſitions, two parts of ſpeech which are not to be found in thoſe languages *.

But, when I ſpeak of barbarous languages, I muſt not be underſtood to mean

* See what I have ſaid upon the ſubject of *ſyntax*, Vol. ii. Book iii. Chap. 1.

all the languages ſpoken by nations we call barbarous: For there are ſome of theſe nations that ſpeak languages of very great art, ſuch as that ſpoken by the *Garani* in the country of Paraguay, in South America; another, of greater art ſtill, ſpoken in that great country, in the ſame continent of South America, known by the name of Patagonia. The Gothic too, (which, as we uſe the word, ſhould denote a language altogether barbarous), was a language of much greater art than any of its deſcendants, ſuch as the German, Swediſh, or Engliſh. Even the languages of Lapland and Greenland are in ſome reſpects more artificial languages than any ſpoken by the civilized nations of Europe. And the language of the Algonkins, in North America, is, in ſome things, even too artificial. Of all theſe languages I have given a particular account in another part of this work *, where I have ſaid, that I do not think it is poſſible that thoſe nations, ſo little advanced in other arts of life, ſhould have invented ſuch

* Vol. i. Book iii. Chap. 10. of this Work.

artificial languages, but they muſt have learned them by intercourſe with ſome other nations more civilized: For that there have been ſtrange migrations and mixtures of people on this earth, is a fact that cannot be doubted of by thoſe who have ſtudied the hiſtory of man *,

* Vol. i. p. 546. of this Work, where I mention a very ſenſible obſervation of Herodotus, upon the ſubject of a colony of Medes being found in the middle of Scythia.

CHAP. III.

Greater variety both of ſound and ſenſe in compoſition than in ſingle words.—The greater variety the greater beauty—alſo the greater difficulty.—The wonderful variety of compoſition in the learned languages.—Of compoſition in the barbarous languages.—There muſt be more or leſs of the art of compoſition among ſuch barbarous nations as hold public aſſemblies, and therein make harangues.—A ſtory to that purpoſe.

I come now to ſpeak of words in compoſition, where there muſt of neceſſity be much greater variety, both of ſound and ſenſe, than of ſingle words. And, where there is the greateſt variety, if there be art and ſyſtem at the ſame time, there alſo the greateſt beauty muſt be. Thus, an heroic poem, ſuch as the Iliad or Odyſſey, is a

much finer thing than a tragedy, becauſe it is a whole, as well as a tragedy, but of much greater extent and variety, and containing many *peripeteias*, and ſurpriſing changes of fortune; whereas tragedy has but one. And, for the ſame reaſon, a tragedy is a much finer thing than an epigram. And, accordingly, the maſters of the writing art tell us, that, as ſtile conſiſts of two things, the choice of words, and the compoſition of them, there is much greater difficulty, as well as beauty, in the latter, than in the former.

In compoſition, there is indeed a wonderful variety. For, 1*mo*, in languages of art, which have caſes, tenſes, genders, and numbers, there is a variety of arrangement, to which it is difficult to ſet bounds—Then there is the ſyntax, or conſtruction of the words, either plain and ſimple, or figured—Then the figures of the ſenſe, that is, rhetorical figures, by which the ſenſe is expreſſed in ſome uncommon way, are ſo many in number, that they cannot be numbered *—Then there is the com-

* Vol. iii. of this work, p. 107.

poſition of periods, and the diviſion of theſe into members, more or fewer, and variouſly connected together, and differing in the ſenſe as well as in the ſtructure of the words —And, *laſtly*, in the moſt perfect language, there is a variety of rhythm and melody, which makes a great part of the beauty of their compoſition *.

What beauty of compoſition there is in the barbarous languages, is not eaſy to ſay. But, among ſuch nations as are ſo far advanced in the arts of life, as to hold aſſemblies, and deliberate about public affairs, it is evident that, in their ſpeeches, there muſt be more or leſs of compoſition. I have heard a ſtory of an Indian orator, who, at a congreſs or *talk*, as they call it, with the then Britiſh governour of Florida, Commodore Johnſton, being frequently interrupted by the interpreter, who ſtopped him, in order to explain to the Governour what he ſaid, at laſt loſt patience; and, ſays he, 'I can bear this no longer: 'My diſcourſe, cut thus into pieces, can

* Vol. ii. Book iii. Chap. 7.

'have no more effect than the water could 'have upon that great beaſt of yours,' pointing to a ſaw-mill at ſome diſtance, 'if it were to fall upon it drop by drop.' Now this orator muſt have had as perfect an idea of the *flumen orationis*, and the effects it produces, as a Cicero or Demoſthenes.

CHAP. IV.

An account of the Greek language.—This the moſt perfect language the author knows.—Its reſemblance to the Sanſcrit language of India.—From the Greek language the author has formed his notion of what is moſt perfect in language.—Of the ſound of the Greek language.—More ſounds in it than we can pronounce.—Vowels in Homer frequently gaping upon one another.—Alſo rhymes, *both of verſes and of hemiſtics.—The words in Greek neither too ſhort nor too long.—The ſhorteſt words are thoſe that occur the moſt frequently, ſuch as Conjunctions and Prepoſitions.—The terminations of the Greek words moſt various and moſt pleaſant to the ear.—None of their words terminate in mute conſonants.—Difference of* ſpirits *in Greek.—This ſhould not be confounded with* loud *and* low.—*No ſuch diſtinction*

betwixt the ſyllables of the ſame word in Greek or Latin.

THESE are my obſervations upon languages in general, as well thoſe of art as the barbarous. I proceed now to apply theſe obſervations to particular languages of art, or which are reputed ſuch. And I will begin with the Greek, the language the moſt perfect that I know, or, I believe, that is known; though, from what we hear of the Indian Sanſcrit language, we have reaſon to think that it is likewiſe a language of wonderful art, and we are ſure that, in ſome reſpects, it reſembles very much the Greek, particularly in the verbs, of which the Sanſcrit has a claſs that are conjugated in the ſame manner as the verbs in —μι in Greek *.

* This curious fact is averred by a gentleman from India, whom I know, Mr Braſſey, who has written a grammar of the Bengalleſe language, which he ſays is a dialect of the Sanſcrit, as well as the other languages ſpoken in India. See what I have ſaid of this language, in Vol. ii. p. 530.

When I come to apply my general obſervations to the Greek, the reader will no doubt perceive that I have formed my idea of a perfect language upon the Greek. Other men, of greater genius and more learned in philoſophy, may, from theory and ſpeculation merely, form the idea of what is moſt perfect in language, and then apply that idea to any particular language they may think proper to ſtudy: But, for my part, I begin where thoſe gentlemen end, and not only in language, but in every thing belonging to art or nature, I form my ſyſtem from facts and obſervations; and, as to language in particular, I am ſure that, without diligently ſtudying the Greek, I ſhould never have had any notion of what is moſt perfect in this greateſt and moſt uſeful art among men.

To begin with the ſound of the Greek, it will be found to have all thoſe things I have required to make a language perfect in that reſpect. For, in the *firſt* place, it has all the ſounds that the human mouth can utter, or ear hear, with any pleaſure. And I am perſuaded it has a greater vari-

ety than we can pronounce; for, beſides the vowels which it aſpirates, and the conſonants θ and φ, it has an aſpirated κ or χ, which, when prefixed to a vowel, we cannot diſtinguiſh from the vowel aſpirated. Thus we cannot diſtinguiſh in our pronunciation betwixt the firſt ſyllables of the two words ϗαμα and χαμαι. Then there is the Æolic *digamma*, which I am perſuaded was uſed by Homer, tho' not marked, I believe, in any manuſcript of him, any more than in the printed editions. It had a ſound diſtinct either from the Greek φ, or the Latin *f*; and therefore Claudius invented a new character to mark it *. What is called the proper diphthongs, which raiſe and ſwell the ſound of the language ſo much, we can pronounce; but the improper diphthongs, ſuch as ᾳ, ῃ, ῳ, though we are ſure

* It was one of the three new letters invented by this Emperor. See Suetonius, in his Life, Cap. 41. and the *notae variorum* on the paſſage. It is ſtill to be ſeen in antient inſcriptions, and is uſed, in ſome words, in place of the V conſonant, which ſhows that it muſt have had a ſound different from that conſonant, as well as from the conſonant F. See what I have further ſaid of the *Digamma*, Vol. ii. p. 240.

they were not ſimple ſounds but ſome way compounded, we cannot pronounce.

In ſo great a variety of ſounds, there muſt be ſome very harſh, ſuch as the aſpirated conſonants χ and θ; but they are ſo mixed with others more ſweet and pleaſant, that the ſound is neither too ſoft and effeminate, nor too rough and auſtere, but an admirable compoſition of both. In ſome words, they join the two rough ſounds, I mentioned, together, as in the word αχθομαι and χριμφθεις: In which laſt the φ and θ are joined together, and the conſonant μ prefixed; which I think does very well by way of variety. And, for the ſame reaſon, they ſometimes do as the barbarous languages do very frequently, join vowels together, not as diphthongs, but in different ſyllables, and not only different vowels, but the ſame vowel, as in that famous line of Homer, which, it is ſaid, deterred Plato from writing verſes,

Ηιονες βοοωσιν εξευγμενης ἀλος εξω.

And there is nothing more common in Homer, and nothing more beautiful in point of

ſound than the —οιο. And, in general, in Homer, and in all the Ionic writers, there is a great deal of gaping of vowels upon one another, both in the ſame and in different words. This, I think, if there be not too much of it, ſwells the ſound of the language, and, I muſt own, pleaſes me, though it offended the delicate ears of later times: And, particularly Iſocrates has, with what I would call a ſophiſtical nicety, moſt carefully avoided it. In Homer, too, there are like endings, both of verſes and of hemiſtics, which I think a beauty alſo, (and ſo they are reckoned by the antient critics), if they be not too frequent, which they are not in Homer; for he only uſes them when he has a mind to adorn his diction, as in his ſimilies, which are the moſt ornamented part of his poem; nor do I remember that he ever uſes them in his narrative or ſpeeches *.

* Homer has followed Ariſtotle's rules, as in other things, ſo in ſtile, which he ſays ought only to be laboured, and much ornamented, εν τοις αργοις μεροσι, that is, in ſuch parts of the poem where there is neither reaſoning, character, or ſentiments, to be expreſſed; and he might have added, where there is no nar-

The words in Greek are neither too long, like the words in the barbarous languages, nor too ſhort, like the words of ſome modern languages, by which the flow of the language is much interrupted, (there being neceſſarily, as I have obſerved, a ſtop more or leſs betwixt the words, ſo that the ſpeech muſt be full of breaks), but of a moderate length, with the variety of ſome longer and ſome ſhorter. And it is to be obſerved, that the monoſyllables, or very ſhort words, are almoſt all words that occur very frequently, ſuch as prepoſitions, conjunctions, and the article; theſe, if they were long words, occurring ſo often, would make the diſcourſe cumberſome and tedious.

The terminations of the words in Greek are as various as poſſible conſiſtently with the pleaſure of the ear, being very different, not only in different words, but in the ſame word, by the variation of genders,

rative; for, as by narrative the buſineſs of the poem is carried on, it cannot be ſaid to be ἀργος, that is, a part where the action ſtands ſtill, as it does in the ſimilies. See Ariſt. *Poetic.* Cap. 24. *in fine.*

numbers, caſes, and tenſes *. Many words they conclude with a diphthong, ſuch as αι, οι, ει ου; which makes the pronunciation of ſuch words go off with a ſound that both pleaſes and fills the ear, the termination being, as I have obſerved, the moſt ſtriking part of the ſound of a word. But they end no words with a mute conſonant, ſuch as β, π, δ, which make a harſh and abrupt concluſion †: Much leſs do they conclude with an aſpirated conſonant, ſuch as θ, with which ſo many words in Engliſh conclude, but which we ſhould think inſufferably harſh, and ſhould ſay with the French, that it *fleaed our ears*, if we were not ſo much accuſtomed to it ‡.

* Antient Metaph. Vol. iii. p. 220. where I have ſhown, that, from the ſame Greek verb, there may be formed tenſes and participles of different terminations to the number of two thouſand.

† This is obſerved by Ariſtotle, in his *Poetics*, Cap. 21. where he obſerves alſo that they terminated no noun with a ſhort vowel; the reaſon of which ſeems to have been, that the voice could not reſt upon a ſhort vowel, as on a proper baſis, and therefore the word could not be concluded in ſuch a way as to pleaſe and fill the ear.

‡ The Greeks have but one little word ending in the mute κ, viz. ουκ; but, when a vowel follows, they

That the Greeks might have all the variety poſſible in the ſound of their language, they obſerved that certain ſyllables were enunciated with a breath much thicker, and more condenſed, as it were, than others; and hence the diſtinction of the two ſpirits *, which, as I have obſerved, we muſt not confound with the diſtinction of loud and low, in the ſyllables of our words; a diſtinction which I am perſuaded was unknown both to the Greeks and Latins, who pronounced all the ſyllables of the words upon a level, as the French pronounce their corrupt dialect of the Latin. And my reaſon for thinking ſo is, that, if there had been accents, ſuch as are in our language and ſome other modern

make it end in σ, uſing ξ inſtead of κσ: And, as the word is ſo uſed in Latin, I am perſuaded it was originally only uſed in Greek in that way. But, afterwards, where a conſonant followed, they threw out the σ, for the ſake of the better ſound, as they frequently did on other occaſions.

* See what I have ſaid upon the ſubject of *Spirits*, Vol. ii. p. 34. where I have ſhown that the nice Greek ear perceived a third or middle ſound betwixt the *tenuis* and the *aſpirated*.

languages, making ſo great a variety in the pronunciation of words, it is impoſſible to ſuppoſe that the antient grammarians would not have taken notice of it.

I will ſay no more here upon the articulation of the Greek language, but will refer the reader, who may deſire to know more of this ſubject, to a diſſertation which I have written upon the ſound of the Greek language, and annexed to the Second Volume of this Work; where he will obſerve how the Greeks have contrived to ſweeten and vary the ſound of their language, by adding, taking away, changing, or tranſpoſing of letters.

CHAP. V.

Of the muſic of the Greek language.—It conſiſts, like other muſic, of melody *and* rhythm.*—It has melody in ſucceſſion, and may be conſidered as having muſic in parts.—Of the difference betwixt the melody of muſic and that of ſpeech.—Of the* rhythm *of the Greek language, and the beauty it muſt have given to their pronunciations—The muſic of language known even among ſome barbarous nations—The northern nations of Europe probably got their language from nations who ſpoke a muſical language; but not having a genius for muſic, they loſt that part of the language.—The Greeks a moſt muſical nation—got the elements of muſic from Egypt, but improved it very much.—Of the muſic of the Indians of North America—how they came to have muſic in their language accounted for.—Conclu-*

ſion of what is ſaid upon the ſound of the Greek language.—Neceſſity of analyſing it, as has been done, in order to form a right judgment of it.

I come now to ſpeak of the muſic of the Greek language, for hitherto I have only conſidered its articulate ſounds. This muſic, like every other muſic, is a compoſition of melody and rhythm.

Melody conſiſts of acute and grave ſounds, either in ſucceſſion, or joined together. The melody of the Greek language is the melody of ſucceſſion; for, when the acute accent is put upon any ſyllable of a word, and the reſt are ſounded grave, then is there that melody. But, beſides this, the acute and grave are often both put upon the ſame ſyllable, which is what is called the circumflex accent. Then the melody of the Greek language may be conſidered of the other kind, that is, a combination of the acute and grave joined together, which makes what is commonly called *harmony*, or muſic in parts. For, tho' both ſounds are not heard preciſely in the

ſame time, as is the caſe of muſic in parts, properly ſo called, the acute and grave, being both on the ſame ſyllable, are ſo cloſely connected, that they may be conſidered as one ſound; and they certainly have the effect of ſwelling and raiſing the ſound, which is one of the chief effects of harmony.

Rhythm is ſo neceſſary to muſic, that there can be no good muſic without it, nor, indeed, any thing deſerving the name of muſic. The rhythm of antient muſic was divided into feet, as well as the rhythm of their verſe; and I am perſuaded it was chiefly by rhythm that their muſic performed the wonderful things aſcribed to it. This is likewiſe a part of the muſic of the Greek language; and it is produced by what we call the quantity of the ſyllables, that is, their length compared with one another, the long being to the ſhort in the ratio of *two* to *one*. Theſe, mixed together in the language, muſt have made a moſt pleaſant variety to the learned ears of the Greeks. And, though our ears be not formed to that

kind of rhythm, yet it muſt be allowed to be very natural; for the vocal ſounds in every language, whether by themſelves or joined with conſonants, may be made ſome long and ſome ſhort, which is much better than if they were all ſounded of the ſame length, as is the caſe in moſt modern languages, and particularly in the French *.

There are ſome, I know, who think this notion of mine, of the muſic of the Greek language, is a mere fancy. But, is it poſſible that there can be a mixture of grave and acute ſounds, diſtinguiſhed by certain intervals, without a muſic of ſome kind or another? That the ſounds of the Greek language were ſo diſtinguiſhed, we are aſſured by Dionyſius the Halicarnaſſian †. But the muſic of it was different from the common muſic in more than one reſpect. In the *firſt* place, it did not riſe ſo high, not

* See upon this ſubject of *Quantity*, Vol. ii. Book 2. Chap. 5. and 6.

† See a tranſlation of the paſſage, Vol. ii. of this work, p. 284.

above a fifth, as the Halicarnaſſian tells us. 2*do*, It had not the variety of the common muſic. And, 3*tio*, what is obſerved by the antient critics to have made the chief difference, was, that the common muſic was *diaſtematic*, that is, had its tones diſtinct, and ſeparated from one another by perceptible intervals, and not run together; whereas the muſic of ſpeech was εν ρυσει, as they expreſſed it, that is, going on by ſlides, the tones inſenſibly running into one another. In this way they roſe from the grave to the acute, and deſcended again from the acute to the grave. And in this way the Greek language continued ſtill to be ſpeech, and was neither ſong nor recitative, though very different from any ſpeech we ever heard *.

And here it may be wondered, that the barbarous languages, particularly ſome of

* Of the difference betwixt the melody of ſpeech and the melody of muſic, ſee Vol. ii. p. 286. The whole Chapter, I think, is worth the reading, by thoſe who have curioſity enough to know a thing of which we have no practice, and hardly an idea; I mean the muſic of the antient languages.

North America *, ſhould have tones and rhythms, and yet the modern languages of Europe have none. But the northern nations of Europe, of whom the preſent inhabitants are deſcended, appear to have been very little favoured by the Muſes and Graces; for, though in the accounts we have of the Scandinavian nations a great deal is ſaid of their poetry, we hear little or nothing of their muſic; and the moſt northern of all thoſe nations, I mean the Laplanders, as we are well informed by a Daniſh miſſionary, one Lemmius, who was ten years among them, have ſo little genius for muſic, as not to be able to learn, without the greateſt difficulty, the common church-tunes †: And, as to inventing an art of muſic, or any other liberal art, I believe them abſolutely incapable. Their language, I am perſuaded, they learned from ſome other nation, and perhaps got it with the muſical tones and rhythms, but theſe they have loſt; and I think it is not unlikely that they introduced, in place of

* See page 11. of this Volume.

† See an account of this country, written by this miſſionary in very good Latin.

them, what we call *accents*, ſuch as the modern Greeks uſe in place of their antient accents, and which, I believe, take place in all the dialects of the Gothic and Saxon, as well as in our dialect. Theſe, inſtead of the muſic of the human voice, the fineſt of all muſic, reſemble the beating of a drum, having no other variation but that of loud and ſoft, quick and ſlow *. On the other hand, the Greeks were a moſt muſical people; and, though they may have brought the elements of that as well as of other arts from Egypt, I am perſuaded they improved it very much; and, as to poetry, I believe they invented it, ſince we do not read of the Egyptians having any poetry, though we know they had muſic in the moſt antient times †. Such being the genius of the Greeks, I think it was almoſt of neceſſity that their language ſhould be muſical; for a very muſical people will ſpeak and move, and do almoſt every thing, to muſic.

* See upon the ſubject of *modern accents*, Vol. ii. Book 2. Chap. 4. and Book 3. Chap. 8.

† Vol. ii. of this work, p. 228.

As to the Indians of North America, they have not yet got poetry, but they have had muſic as early, I believe, as any art of life, without excepting even language; and their muſic is always accompanied with words*, reciting their own exploits, or thoſe of their anceſtors, which they ſing at their war feaſts; nor is there any thing of greater antiquity among them. Now, it was very natural that their words, even when not ſung, ſhould have ſomething of a muſical cadence, eſpecially if we ſuppoſe that muſic and language grew up together.

And here I finiſh my obſervations upon the ſound of the Greek language, where the reader may perhaps think that I have dwelt too long upon trifling and minute things. But it is impoſſible to give a

* L'Affiteau, in his work entitled, *Moeurs des Sauvages Ameriquains*, Vol. i. p. 521. obſerves, that they ſhorten their words in order to adapt them to the rhythm of the muſic. Here we may obſerve the beginning of Poetry; for poetry is nothing more than meaſured rhythm.

ſcientific account of the ſound of any language, without analyſing it, as I have done, into words, ſyllables, and letters, and likewiſe into tones and rhythms, obſerving what each of theſe has peculiar. Without ſuch a reſolution of a language into its elements, we can form no rational judgment, even of the ſound of it, nor compare it, in that reſpect, with other languages.

CHAP. VI.

Of the words of the Greek language, conſidered as ſignificant.—The art of the Greek language moſt wonderful in this reſpect.—Of the noun, *and the various things denoted by its declenſion.—Of the* verb, *and the ſtill greater variety of expreſſion by it.—Of the words in Greek formed from the Verb.—The Greek verb, though expreſſing ſo many different things, not incumbered or overloaded.*

I Come now to ſpeak of the words of the Greek language as ſignificant. And here the art of the Greek language appears ſtill more wonderful. For as much as the meaning is of greater excellence than the ſound of the words, ſo much greater ſkill have the artificers of this language

ſhown by the invention of an analogy, as it is called, whereby all the different circumſtances of things, and their relations to one another, are expreſſed, without making new words, and only by changes made upon the ſame word: So that the Greek language, at the ſame time that it is moſt copious and rich of words, is as frugal of them as poſſible. I will begin with ſingle words.

Single words are by grammarians divided into what is called parts of ſpeech; and theſe they make to be eight. But, as I have ſhown elſewhere *, if we are to ſpeak philoſophically, there are but two, correſponding to the grand diviſion of things into ſubſtance and accident, viz. the *noun*, by which ſubſtances are expreſſed, and the *verb*, expreſſing accidents. Now, all the ſeveral qualities and relations of ſubſtances or nouns to one another, are expreſſed by what is called the declenſion of nouns, that is, by their caſes, numbers, and genders; which, at the ſame time that they vary the

* Vol. ii. of this Work, p. 28. and following.

termination, and ſo add much to the pleaſure of the ear, expreſs the thing moſt accurately, particularly with reſpect to number, diſtinguiſhing not only betwixt *one* and *many*, but betwixt *two* and *many* *.

The other part of ſpeech, according to this philoſophical diviſion, comprehends the other ſeven, according to the common diviſion; but I ſhall ſpeak only of one of them, viz. the verb, which is the glory of the Greek analogy; for, by the ſeveral changes made upon it, it expreſſes, 1*mo*, Whether the action be done, or ſuffered; 2*do*, Whether the action be perfect or imperfect; 3*tio*, Whether the perſon who ſpeaks is the actor or ſufferer, or whether it be the perſon ſpoken to, or ſome third perſon or thing; 4*to*, what the number of actors or ſufferers is, whether one, two, or more; 5*to*, The time of the action or ſuffering. And here there is a wonderful va-

* See what I have ſaid of the philoſophy of this part of ſpeech, Vol. ii. of this Work, Book. i. Chap. 4. alſo Chap. 9. where I have given a philoſophical account of the caſes of nouns, ſuch as hitherto has not been given.

riety; for, not only the three great diviſions of time, the *paſt*, *preſent*, and *future*, are expreſſed, but the compoſitions of theſe, the *paſt* with the *preſent*, with the *future*, and with the *paſt*: And, laſtly, there is a form of the word, which expreſſes that the action is ſimply paſt, without determining whether it be likewiſe preſent or not; in ſhort, it denotes the paſt indefinitely. 6*to*, The verb expreſſes alſo the diſpoſition of the mind of the ſpeaker, whether he affirms, commands, wiſhes, or prays. This is expreſſed by three forms of the verb, which we call *moods*, viz. the *indicative*, the *imperative*, the *optative*. 7*mo*, There is a fourth *mood*, which expreſſes ſimply the action of the verb, with the addition only of *time*. This is what is called the *infinitive* mood *. 8*vo*, There is

* This mood, with the article prefixed, is to be conſidered in Greek as an abſtract noun. το πραττειν, for example, is a noun, as much as πραξις, with the addition only of the ſignification of *time*.——— alſo this explained in Vol. ii. p. 40 The Latins likewiſe uſe the infinitive this way; but, as they have not an article, it often makes the expreſſion obſcure, becauſe it is doubtful whether the infinitive is to be underſtood as a noun, or in the ordinary way as a

a fifth mood, called the *ſubjunctive* or *conjunctive*, by which it is expreſſed whether the verb be principal in the ſentence, or dependent upon another verb. 9*no*, The object, too, of the action is expreſſed, as far as that is poſſible; for, by the nature of things, it is impoſſible, by any flection, or change of any kind made upon the word, to expreſs all the ſeveral things or perſons that may be the object of the action. But, if that object is either the perſon who ſpeaks, or the perſon ſpoken to, or the perſon or thing which is the ſubject of the diſcourſe, it is expreſſed by that form of the verb we call the middle voice. *Laſtly*, There is a form of the verb which has the ſignification of an adjective; but, beſides *quality*, it expreſſes *time*. This kind of adjective is what is called a *participle*. And likewiſe from the verb are formed many ſubſtantive nouns; and ſo rich is the analogy of the Greek in this particular, that, not only from different tenſes are nouns derived,

mood, and ſo to be conſtrued with another verb in the ſentence.

but from different perſons of the ſame tenſe, of which there is a remarkable example in the preterperfect tenſe paſſive of the verb ποιῶ, viz. πεποιημαι, from every perſon of the ſingular number of which are derived as many nouns; 1*mo*, ποιημα, from the firſt perſon, ſignifying the thing made; 2*do*, ποιησις, from the ſecond perſon, ſignifying the action of making; and, *laſtly*, ποιητης, from the third perſon, denoting the maker.

What I have ſaid here concerning the Greek verb, I have ſaid ſhortly, referring to what I have ſaid, at great length, upon the ſubject, in the Second Volume of this Work *, where thoſe who are not ſatisfied with having learned at ſchool the common rules of the Greek grammar, and to underſtand the words and phraſes of the language, may, if they pleaſe, ſtudy the ſcience of the moſt wonderful art among men, and learn to know that the principles of no art, not even of grammar,

* Book i. Chap. 10. and following.

the firſt art we are taught, can be underſtood without philoſophy.

What appears as wonderful, I think, as any thing I have mentioned concerning the Greek verb, is that, with all theſe various expreſſions of different things, with which one ſhould think it would be quite incumbered and overloaded, yet it is not at all difficult to be underſtood, and by the uſe of reading only, without either ſpeaking or hearing, it becomes familiar to us.

Such being the nature of this part of Speech in Greek, I do not wonder that a learned and pious Profeſſor of Divinity, whom I knew, could not be convinced but that it came down from heaven ready made, ſo much he thought it above the invention of men. But, though I think that man, by his natural faculties, having once got ſome uſe of language, might have perfected the verb, as well as every other part of ſpeech; yet, as the beginning of all things is moſt difficult, I think there is reaſon to

doubt whether man could of himſelf have begun to articulate, or whether he muſt not have been at firſt taught by ſome ſuperior intelligence, ſuch as the Egyptians ſay they were by their God *Teuth*. So far, therefore, I agree with the learned Profeſſor.

All the various concomitant ſignifications, ſuperadded to the principal ſignification of the Greek noun and verb, are produced by flexion, which is no doubt one of the greateſt, perhaps the greateſt, artifice of the Greek language; but there are two other likewiſe of ſingular uſe for preventing the too great multiplication of words, and which, therefore, deſerve to be taken notice of, I mean compoſition and derivation.

CHAP. VII.

Of the compoſition *in Greek.—The uſe of it in ſaving words, and making the ſyſtem of the language more perfect.—Of the variety of its compoſition with verbs and prepoſitions.—Of* derivation *in the Greek language.—The account, given by the author, of the Greek derivation, makes the language a wonderful ſyſtem of art.—The ſame was the ſyſtem of Hempſterhuſius.—Not probable that both Hempſterhuſius and the Author ſhould have fallen into the ſame error, without communication with one another.—Other arguments in favour of this ſyſtem of etymology.—The Greek, according to this ſyſtem, reſembles very much the Sanſcrit language.—The language of Homer particularly has a wonderful reſemblance to that language.*

BY compoſition, two or more words of different ſignifications are joined together, in order to produce another word that has a connection in its ſignification with the component words. That this will often happen in the variety of things expreſſed by language, is evident; and the hearer or reader, knowing the meaning of the words in the compoſition, will readily know the meaning of the compounded word; whereas, if it had been expreſſed by a word quite new, it would have burthened his memory, and diſtracted his attention. Beſides, the compounding words, as well as deriving them, (of which I ſhall ſpeak anon), makes more uniformity in the language, and more a ſyſtem of it, than it could be otherwiſe.

Of all the compoſitions in the Greek language, none is more common, or produces greater effects, than the compoſition of verbs with prepoſitions. It is to it chiefly that is owing that wonderful accuracy of expreſſion ſo remarkable in Greek, by which every the leaſt circumſtance of an action is expreſſed in the ſhorteſt way

poſſible, and at the ſame time very clearly; and, if we do not know the force of the prepoſitions, both ſingle and in compoſition, we muſt loſe a great part of the beauty, and even of the ſenſe of the Greek language. It is, I believe, ſingular in the Greek, that they compound often with two, and ſometimes even with three, in order to expreſs every circumſtance of the thing. Thus Homer, deſcribing water coming out of a rock, uſes the word υπεκπροεειν; where it expreſſes not only that the water came out of the rock, but that it came from under the rock, and, further, that it did not ſtagnate at the foot of it, but ran forward *. A language of this kind not only deſcribes but paints, particularly in the uſe that Homer has made of it; and, accordingly, I believe it is generally agreed by the painters, that Homer has furniſhed the beſt ſubjects for hiſtorical painting, of any author, antient or modern.

* See what I have further ſaid upon the ſubject of the Greek prepoſitions, and their compoſition with verbs, Vol. ii. p. 175. 176.

I come now to ſpeak of the derivation in the Greek language. Of this I have given an account in the Second Volume of this Work *; and, if it be a juſt one, the Greek language is certainly a moſt wonderful ſyſtem of art, derived from as few principles as I think is poſſible, only five duads of vowels. That I am in the right, I think it is a ſtrong preſumption, that Hempſterhuſius, the greateſt Greek ſcholar of his time, and likewiſe learned in the Oriental languages, formed the ſame ſyſtem, which he never publiſhed; but a ſcholar of his, one Lennep, has publiſhed it, about five years after my work was publiſhed †. Now, I muſt ſay, that I think that it is much more probable that we are both in the right, than that we have both erred the ſame error. But, ſhould the reader think otherwiſe, he muſt allow it to be a moſt curious literary anecdote, that two perſons, entirely unknown

* Page 188.—193. and the diſſertation there referred to.

† He is Profeſſor of Eloquence and Greek in the Univerſity of Groninghen; and his book is entitled, *Analogia Linguae Graecae*, printed at Utrecht, in 1779.

to one another, ſhould have coincided ſo perfectly, not in one particular thing, but in a whole ſyſtem of ſcience.

Further, it may be obſerved, that, as the vowels are eſſential parts of all language, without which there can be no articulation; and, as they are more pliable by their nature than conſonants, and therefore admitting of greater changes and variations, it was moſt natural to derive the whole language from them; much more natural than to derive the Hebrew from triads of conſonants. That the flexions of verbs are chiefly by vowels, muſt be admitted. If ſo, is it not natural to ſuppoſe that the verb itſelf has been originally formed in the ſame way; and, as all the nouns in Greek are derived from verbs *, it follows that the whole words of the language, except ſome prepoſitions and connecting particles, which are to be conſidered, not as words, but rather as pegs and nails that faſten words together †, are derived from combinations of vowels.

* Vol. ii. p. 188.

† Ibid.

Laſtly, The learned language of India, I mean the Sanſcrit, is, as we are well informed, derived from a few words, or rather ſounds, having no determinate ſignification. And, by later diſcoveries, we learn that there is a wonderful reſemblance betwixt the Sanſcrit and the Greek, in that capital part of ſpeech, the verb; for the Sanſcrit has exactly the ſame form of a verb, as that of the verbs in —μι in Greek *. And there is another reſemblance betwixt the Sanſcrit and the oldeſt language in Greek, and I think the beſt, I mean Homer's language, that all the other languages of India are dialects of the Sanſcrit, as I am perſuaded that all the ſeveral languages, ſpoken in Greece in later times, are dialects of Homer's language. And this perſuades me that the ſyſtem, both of the Sanſcrit and the Greek, has come originally from the parent country of all arts and ſciences, Egypt, though no doubt the words and phraſes would be greatly altered; for there is nothing to hinder the ſame art to be practiſed in different countries, but with very different materials.

* See page 25. of this Volume.

There is one advantage which the Sanſcrit language enjoys, I think, in common with the language of Homer; and it is this, that, if you are maſter of the language of the Sanſcrit, you may make as many words in it as you pleaſe, and they will be readily underſtood by the hearer, if he be alſo maſter of the rules of that analogy *. Now, I think it is evident that we may form numbers of new words according to Homer's analogy, and they will be readily underſtood by a ſcholar who has ſtudied that analogy.

There is another reſemblance, as appears to me, betwixt the Sanſcrit and the language of Homer. We are informed that this Indian language never was at any time the language of the vulgar, but of philoſophers only. Now, I am perſuaded that Homer's language never was ſpoken entire by any one tribe of Greeks, being a language much too various and artificial to have ever been the language of the vul-

* See p. 25. of this Vol. and p. 530. of Vol. ii.

gar in any country. It was therefore the language only of the Poets or Bards, who were at that time the philoſophers or wiſe men of the country.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Compoſition *in Greek—the greateſt beauty of all—requires variety as much as any thing elſe belonging to language.—The arrangement in Greek wonderfully various.—By a proper arrangement the ſenſe conveyed more forcibly than it could be otherwiſe.—This compoſition, though difficult to be underſtood at firſt, becomes eaſy.—It appeared ſo beautiful to the ſcholars that flouriſhed after the reſtoration of letters, that they diſdained to write in their vernacular tongue.—Of the many particles uſed in Greek.—The uſe of theſe particles, both with reſpect to the ſenſe and ſound.—Of the wonderful beauty of the compoſition of Demoſthenes, when pronounced by himſelf.*

I Come now to ſpeak of Compoſition in Greek, the moſt material thing in every language, and for the ſake of which all the reſt of the grammatical art is intended. It is almoſt needleſs to obſerve that by compoſition here I mean not that compoſition

by which ſingle words are formed, of which I have already treated *, but that compoſition by which words are put together in ſentences; as to which, I have already obſerved †, that the chief beauty of it is variety; for, if it were always the ſame, though ever ſo beautiful, it would ſoon become diſguſting. Now, the Greek language, expreſſing all the various connections of words by flexion, particularly by genders, numbers, and caſes, admits of a wonderful variety of arrangement, in ſo much, that it is only indeclineable words that require to be connected by juxta-poſition. In this way, not only the ear muſt be greatly pleaſed, but I think I have ſhown, that, by the poſition of emphatical words in certain parts of the ſentence, the ſenſe is conveyed more forcibly than it could be otherwiſe ‡; and, as the meaning, where the compoſition is in periods or long ſentences, cannot be divided and taken ſepa-

* In the preceding Chapter.

† Chap. 3. of this Volume.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 569. and following,—p. 572. and following.

rately, but muſt be apprehended altogether or not at all, it is evident that the ſenſe in that way comes upon the mind more cloſe and embodied, as it were, and conſequently more forcibly than when broken down, and frittered into ſmall pieces.

This compoſition, ſo various, and ſo different from our uniform compoſition, and which, therefore, appears to us unnatural, is no doubt at firſt difficult to the young beginner, both in Greek and Latin. But it is ſurpriſing how ſoon it becomes eaſy to us, and even familiar; and, at laſt we deſpiſe every other kind of compoſition; which is the reaſon why the learned, after the reſtoration of learning, and for more than one hundred years after that, ſcorned to write in their *vernacular* language, which they conſidered to be fit only for *ſervants* or *ſlaves*, as the word denotes; but they wrote in Latin, (ſometimes in Greek), and converſed in Latin with one another. In Germany, they ſtill write in Latin upon any learned ſubject, though the Latin be not ſo good as might

be wiſhed. For my own part, if I could write in Latin as well as ſome of the ſcholars in England, and particularly my friend Sir George Baker phyſician in London, writing, as I do, not for the vulgar, I would never write in Engliſh, or in any modern language. When I was at a foreign Univerſity many years ago, I was in the habit of both ſpeaking and writing Latin, and could do it tolerably well; but this faculty I have now loſt, and I am too old, much too old, to recover it.—But to return to the ſubject.

Theſe long periods in Greek or Latin, ſo artificially arranged, and conſiſting of ſeveral members, various not only in the ſtructure of the words but in the matter, (which ſhould be the caſe of every long period well compoſed,) if they be not well read, with a proper variation of tone ſuitable to the difference of matter, will not be intelligible even to the moſt learned ears. But this very change of tone, at the ſame time that it makes the ſenſe quite clear and diſtinct, gives a beautiful variety to the pronunciation, as we muſt be ſen-

ſible from hearing well read the periods of Demoſthenes or Milton.

There is one thing remaining to be ſpoken to, which, in my apprehenſion, gave as great a flow to the Greek compoſition as any thing I have hitherto mentioned, and made them ſpeak *ore rotundo*, more than any other people in the world. What I mean, is the uſe of ſo many particles, or little words, more by far than are to be found, I believe, in any other language in the world. By the flexion of nouns, adjectives, and verbs, words are connected together; but by theſe particles the ſenſe is connected, ſo that we know what is to follow by what goes before, and there is no gap or interval in the *flumen orationis*, any more than in a natural ſtream. Thus, when a μεν goes before, we are ſure that ſomething is to follow that has the relation of oppoſition to the thing preceding, and which is marked by the correſpondent particle δε; and, when a τε goes before, we are ſure another conjunction is to follow, joining the ſubſequent thing to the preceding. The particle δη gives an

emphaſis to what follows, which we can hardly expreſs in Engliſh even by a circumlocution.

The particle τοι ſerves a like purpoſe of raiſing the attention, though I think not ſo emphatically as δη. It is the Dorick of σοι, and anſwers to the Latin *tibi*, which is uſed by Lucretius in the ſame ſenſe, where he ſays,

> His *tibi* me rebus quaedam divina voluptas
> Percipit atque horror *.——

Ουν I underſtand to be a particle which connects in the way of reaſoning what follows with what goes before, importing that the one is a conſequence of the other.

Γε appears to me to be a limiting particle, reſtricting the generality of the word or propoſition to which it is applied. Thus, the meaning of that common expreſſion, εμοι γε δοκει, is, *I at leaſt think ſo, whatever others may think;* and it may generally be rendered by *at leaſt* in Engliſh.

* Lib. 3. V. 28.

As the Greeks compound other words, ſo they compound thoſe particles, and they ſay, μεντοι τοιγαρουν, &c. all which, I am perſuaded, have a meaning, but which it is very difficult to expreſs in Engliſh or in any other language. And this has inclined many to believe that the greater part of them had no meaning at all, but were employed merely to give a greater flow to the compoſition. But, tho' they certainly have that effect, I cannot believe that a people of ſo correct a taſte as the Greeks would employ words, and ſo many of them too, merely for the ſake of the ſound, without any meaning, eſpecially in their proſe compoſitions, and in their orations, where they were ſpeaking to the people upon buſineſs of the greateſt importance. The learned world, therefore, I think, are much obliged to the German Profeſſor Hoegenville, who has endeavoured, and I think for the greater part ſucceſsfully, to give a meaning to every one of them.

Being obliged, for the reaſon I have mentioned, to write in Engliſh, it often

grieves me that I cannot give, both to my words and matter, the connection which the Greeks give by the means of theſe particles, ſo that my ſentences, do what I can, are often as much unconnected, as if there were no connection in the matter.

If what I have ſaid of the Greek compoſition be true, how wonderful muſt the orations of Demoſthenes have been, ſpoken by himſelf, with all the graces of action and pronunciation? For, beſides his action, in which he is allowed to have excelled, what pleaſure to the ear muſt have given the melody and rhythm of his language, both much ſtudied by him *—the variety alſo of his artificial ar-

* Vol. ii. p. 382. Of the melody of the Greek language we have hardly, as I have ſaid, an idea; and, as to the rhythm, though we know well enough what it was, yet our ears are not formed to perceive the beauty of it, even in their verſe, and much leſs in their proſe.—See what I have ſaid upon this ſubject, Vol. ii. p. 401. and following, and 409. and following; where I have ſhown how eſſential a part rhythm was, even of their proſe compoſition.

rangement *, his periods divided into members of different lengths, and containing matter of different kinds, and which, therefore, muſt have been ſpoken, as I have obſerved, with changes of tones †—his ſtile too, adorned with figures very different from the figures now uſed, which ſtick out of the work and alter quite the colour of the ſtile, ſuch as *exclamation*, much uſed even by Cicero, and ſuch as *epithets* which are the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtic of the poetic ſtile, but of which the ſtile of Demoſthenes is almoſt entirely free, (for I have read whole orations of his, where there is not a ſingle epithet), the figures he uſes being ſuch as eſcape the attention of the unlearned, and, though the learned perceive that they give an unuſual caſt to the ſtile, yet they do not know what name to give them ?—When I conſider all theſe things, I ſay again that the orations of Demoſthenes, pronounced

* Ibid. p. 363. and following. See alſo the Diſſertation annexed to Vol. ii. on the Compoſition of the antients.

† See an example of a period of Demoſthenes, Vol. iii. p. 60.

by himſelf, not read even by Eſchines *, who, as he was a very good pleader, I ſuppoſe, was alſo a good reader, muſt have been a moſt wonderful thing, and of beauty ſo tranſcendent, that we cannot have any idea of it †; or, if we could form an idea of it, we ſhould not be able to imitate it, even in writing, much leſs in ſpeaking, not having the materials upon which he wrought. In other arts, ſuch as ſtatuary, though we have the materials, yet all connoiſſeurs acknowledge that no modern artiſt has equalled the beauty of the antient Greek ſtatues; but, when a modern language is the materials upon which the writing ar-

* This alludes to a well known ſtory of Æſchines, who having retired to Rhodes, after his baniſhment, read to ſome people there Demoſthenes's famous oration againſt him, entitled, περὶ στεφάνου; and, when they admired it very much, 'What would you have 'thought of it,' ſaid he, 'if you had heard him 'pronounce it?'—See Vol. ii. p. 417.

† See the account given by the Halicarnaſſian of the beauty of rhetorical compoſition, conſiſting of *melody*, *rhythm*, *variety*, or *change*, and, laſtly, what is *proper* or *becoming*. I have quoted the paſſage in Vol. ii. of this Work, p. 381.

tiſt muſt work, it is by nature impoſſible to equal the beauty of the Greek compoſition, as impoſſible as it would be to build a fine palace of rough unhewn pebbles.

Though Demoſthenes exceeded, I believe, all the men of his age in the art of pronunciation, yet an oration muſt firſt be well compoſed, before any pronunciation can make it pleaſe a man of ſenſe and taſte. Now, we know that Demoſthenes applied as much to compoſition as to pronunciation; and, as a model of compoſition, he ſtudied the authors before him, particularly Thucydides, whom it is ſaid he tranſcribed eight times with his own hand; but he has ſhown wonderful judgment in the imitation of him, for he has avoided his perplexed and involved periods, ſo much crouded with matter, that he was reckoned an obſcure writer in the time of Dionyſius the Halicarnaſſian, and, I believe, even when he wrote himſelf; nor do I think that Demoſthenes could have been underſtood, even by the people of Athens, ſenſible and acute as they were, if he had ſpoken to them in the ſtile of Thu-

cydides; but he has imitated him with ſo much diſcretion, that, though he have diverſified his ſtile by figures without name or number, yet he has not crouded them together ſo much as Thucydides has done; (for a ſtile may be too much varied as well as too much the ſame); nevertheleſs his ſtile, ſuch as it is, is ſo much varied, and ſo artificial, that he was not well received at firſt by the people, I ſuppoſe becauſe they did not perfectly underſtand him, till he had learned the art of pronouncing his own periods *.

* See Vol. ii. p. 363. and following.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Latin *language.—That language the oldeſt dialect of the Greek—liker therefore to the Oriental Languages.—It has tones, but not ſo accurately marked as in Greek. —But the quantity of ſyllables accurately obſerved in it.—As to* ſpirits, *much fewer aſpirates than in Greek.—The Latin language defective in the elemental ſounds, particularly in diphthongs.— Theſe the Latins commonly reſolve.—Examples of this.—The greateſt difference of all betwixt the ſound of the two languages is, that the Latins terminate ſo many words in mute conſonants, the Greeks none at all.—The terminations of* -orum *and* -arum, *in the Latin language, not pleaſant.*

THE next language to which I ſhall apply my general obſervations is the Latin. This language is the moſt antient dialect of the Greek known, brought into Italy by a colony of Arcadians, under Oenotrus, about ſeventeen generations before the Trojan war, reſembling more the Doric and Eolic than any other dialect of Greek now known. But, as it came off from the original ſtock, much earlier than either of theſe dialects, it has more of the roughneſs of the Hebrew, or ſome other Egyptian or Oriental language, from which I am perſuaded the Greek is derived. It has, however, accents or tones, which I am perſuaded all languages had originally, though they may have loſt them in proceſs of time, through ignorance and barbarity; for muſic being, as I imagine, coëval with language, it was moſt natural that it ſhould be joined, and, as it were, incorporated with it. Now, the Latins being a muſical people, as well as the Greeks, of whom they were deſcended, preſerved the original muſic of the language, and began the pronunciation of it in the wind-pipe, the greater or leſs dilation of which gives a language

its muſical tones, which the modern languages want entirely, having nothing but articulation produced by the various poſition and action of the organs of the mouth, where our pronunciation begins. But, tho' the Latins had accents, I have a great doubt whether they were ſo accurately meaſured, or ſo exactly obſerved in the pronunciation, as thoſe of the Greeks were. Their grammarians, who treat of accentuation, though they ſpeak of the *acute*, the *grave*, and the *circumflex* *, do not define or meaſure them, as the Halicarnaſſian has done in regard to the Greek accents: And I do not obſerve that any of their authors who have treated of *ſtile*, ſpeak much of the melody of it as one of its beauties †, or commend it, as the Halicarnaſſian does the ſtile of Demoſthenes, for being 'ευμελης ‡.

* See Priſcian and Diomedes, in the Collection of Latin Grammarians, publiſhed by Putchius, p. 1286. et ſeq. and p. 426. et ſeq.

† That theſe authors, however, had an idea of ſuch a beauty, and the practice of it at leaſt in ſome degree, is evident from what Cicero ſays, Lib. ii. Cap. 8. *De Oratore*, Lib. iii. Cap. 50. *ibid.* And in his *Orator*, Cap. 17. and 18.

‡ See what I have ſaid upon this ornament of ſtile in Greek compoſition, Vol. ii. Book iii. Chap. 7.

But, whatever defect there may have been in the melody of the Latin language, the rhythm of it, that is, the quantity of the ſyllables, appears to have been very accurately obſerved. But, as to the diſtinction of ſpirits, they do not appear to have uſed it near ſo much as the Greeks; for they did not aſpirate conſonants at all *, ſo that they had not the ſound of the Greek letters φ, χ, and θ. And they uſed very little aſpiration even of vowels: Thus, they ſaid *oedi* for *hoedi*, *irci* for *hirci* †. And the reaſon of this appears to me very plain, namely, that the Latin language came off from the Greek before it was completed either in the ſound or in the grammatical part. And from thence ariſes this defect, and all the others that I ſhall take occaſion to obſerve, in the Latin language. In later times, when they began to reform their language upon the model of the Greek, they improved the ſound of it, by the uſe of aſpirated conſonants, as well as vowels. Thus, in place of *pulcer*, which they ſaid

* Cicero, *Orator*, Cap. 48.

† Quintilian, *Inſtitutiones*, Lib. i. Cap. 5.

before, they ſaid *pulcher*; in place of *Gracci* they ſaid *Gracchi*; in place of *triumpi* they ſaid *triumphi*, &c. * ; and the uſe of aſpirated vowels became common among them. But, as to conſonants, even in the days of Cicero, there were very few of them aſpirated, except in words taken from the Greek, ſuch as *philoſophia*, which was not Latin till the days of Cicero, though the thing before that was known among them, but it was called *ſapientia*; and *ſapere* was uſed for *philoſophari*, as late as the days of Horace, who ſays,

Scribendi recte *ſapere* eſt principium et fons.
Rem tibi Socraticae poterunt oſtendere chartae.

And not only did the Latins want thoſe aſpirated conſonants, which I think give a beautiful variety to the Greek language; but they did not ſound all the ſix proper

* Quintilian, *dicto loco*; where he tells us that the Greek faſhion of aſpirating conſonants was carried ſo far, that ſome people pronounced *praechones* inſtead of *praecones*, *chenturiones* inſtead of *centuriones*, &c.

diphthongs, at leaſt not in later times; for in the days of Cicero they uſed neither the ει nor the ου. The *ai* they appear always to have uſed, particularly in the genitive ſingular of the firſt declenſion; and they ſometimes divided it, as in the words *patriaï* and *auraï*. The *au* too, and the *eu*, they appear always to have uſed, as in the words *audio*, and *heu*, and *ſeu*. The *oi* too appears always to have been in uſe among them, as in *lœna* and *pœna*, and many others, which I am perſuaded they ſounded as the Greeks did the οι; for we cannot doubt that *poena*, for example, is the Greek word ποινη. But in many of their words they leave out one of the vowels of this high ſounding diphthong, and pronounce it as the ſingle vowel. Thus, of the word οικος, they make *focus*, with the Eolic digamma prefixed, and leaving out the vowel *i*; and of οινος, by leaving out the other vowel, viz. the *o*, they made *vinum*. And, in general, it may be obſerved, that the genius of the language, at leaſt in later times, appears to have been, to reſolve the diphthong, and to ſound only one of the vowels.——Thus, in the declenſion of

animus, in place of the termination οι in the nominative plural, and οις and ους in the dative and accuſative, the Latins have *i*, and *is*, and *os*; and in the genitive ſingular they throw out both vowels, and, in place of ανεμου ſay *animi* *; and, in the third declenſion, in the word *omnis*, for example, in place of *omneis* in the nominative plural, they ſay *omnes* commonly, and ſome of the old writers *omnis*, always leaving out one or other of the vowels. And it is the ſame in the verb; as, in *lego*, in place of ſaying, in the ſecond and third perſon, *legeis* and *legeit*, they ſay *legis* and *legit*.—As to the improper diphthongs, of which the Greek Grammarians make alſo ſix, it does not appear that the Latins ever founded one of them, (nor does any Latin grammarian, as far as I know, ſo much as mention them), which muſt have made the ſound of their language of much leſs variety than that of the Greek †.

* The ancient Greek genitive was ανεμοιο, as it is ſtill uſed in the Ionic dialect: and from thence I imagine is formed the Latin genitive *animi*, by throwing away firſt the final ο, and then the ο in the diphthong.

† That the improper diphthongs were truly diphthongs, as they are called, and differed in their

Thus it appears that, for want of aſpirated conſonants, and having ſo much few-

ſound from the ſimple vowels, cannot be doubted. At the ſame time, we cannot ſuppoſe that they were ſounded in the ſame manner as the proper diphthongs. Thus, for example, ῳ had certainly a ſound different from the proper diphthong οι. It had, however, I am perſuaded, a ſound approaching to it, which I think is evident from the manner of writing it. What, then, was the difference betwixt the two ſounds? And I apprehend it was this, that, in the proper diphthongs, the ſounds of the two vowels were ſo perfectly mixed, that the ear could not diſtinguiſh the one from the other; whereas, in the improper diphthongs, the voice dwelt more upon one of the vowels than upon the other, and which, therefore, was better heard in the pronunciation; and, accordingly, in writing, the ι in the improper diphthong ῳ is marked either by a dot under the ω, or by a ſmall ι ſubjoined to it, which I think plainly indicates, that, in the compoſition making this improper diphthong, the ω was predominant, and more ſtrongly ſounded than the ι. Another example may be given of an improper diphthong, where the ω is alſo predominant, but the other vowel, inſtead of being *poſtponed*, is *praeponed*; as in the word Πηληιαδεω, where, in the ſyllable δεω, the ſound of ε is heard, if it be rightly pronounced, but faintly. It is ſaid by the grammarians, and particularly by Euſtathius, that theſe two letters are pronounced together by a figure which they call συνεκφωνησις, or συνεξησις. But the vowels cannot be run together, without being pronounced as a diphthong proper or improper.—Theſe

er compounded vocal ſounds, the Latin language could neither have that variety, nor that ſwell in the ſound, which the Greek language has. And, further, it is evident that the pronunciation of the Latin muſt have been very much harſher than the Greek, particularly in their terminations, which, as I have obſerved, are a diſtinguiſhing part of the ſound of words*. Now, the termination of a great many Latin words is in mute conſonants, ſuch as *b*, *c*, *d*, and particularly *t* †. Such terminations, I am perſuaded, were as common in Greek, in its original ſtate, as they are now in Latin; and it is one proof among many others, that it was little better than

obſervations I owe to a friend of mine, a learned Profeſſor in the Univerſity of St Andrews, Mr John Hunter.

* P. 5.—31.

† In antient times, there were many more words terminating in *d*, as may be ſeen in antient monuments of the Latin yet preſerved. Thus, they ſaid, *popnlod* for *populo*, *ſententiad* for *ſententia*.—Of the diſtinction betwixt the *liquid* and *mute* conſonants, Vol. ii. p. 233.

a rude and barbarous language when the Latin came off from it. Several veſtiges of this are to be ſeen in the moſt antient dialect of it, next to the Latin, I mean the Doric, where they ſay λεγοντι in place of λεγουσι. Now, I can have no doubt but that in an earlier period they ſaid λεγοντ, or *legunt* as the Latins now ſay. And they uſed much more the canine letter *r* than they do now,—I believe, as much as the Latins uſe it; as is evident from a piece of very antient Doric Greek preſerved to us, viz. a decree of the ſenate of Sparta, againſt Timotheus, a muſician, who had corrupted, as they ſaid, the ſimplicity of the antient muſic, by adding a ſtring to the lyre.

This termination in mute conſonants, ſo harſh and abrupt, makes the language flow not ſo pleaſantly. And that common termination in Latin with the *lowing* letter, as it is called, *m*, abſolutely ſhuts the mouth more than any of the letters that are called mute; and it interrupts the flow of the language ſo much, that it is very frequently elided in their verſe. It

is, however, much uſed by them, both in their declenſions and conjugations; particularly in their genitives plural, inſtead of the Greek ων, they uſe *orum*, which gives occaſion ſometimes to rhymes not agreeable, as that of Horace,

Atque alii, *quorum* comoedia priſca *virorum* eſt:

And their *arums* are of the ſame kind; as *teſtis mearum ſententiarum*. Theſe are Monkiſh rhymes which I am perſuaded Horace would not have uſed, if he could eaſily have avoided it. Now, the ων of the Greek in place of *orum*, and the Æolic αων in place of *arum*, make pleaſant enough rhymes at times, as Homer has ſhown.

CHAP. X.

The words of the Latin language conſidered as ſignificant.—In that reſpect inferior to the Greek more ſtill than in ſound—particularly in the verb.—Examples of the defect of the Latin language in that part of ſpeech—inferior even to the Engliſh.—Defective alſo in participles.—The Latins want alſo the variety of two aoriſts and three futures.—Defective alſo in moods—wanting alſo a voice which the Greeks have in their verbs, and a dual number both in their verbs and their nouns.—The Latin wants one part of ſpeech wholly, viz. *the article.—The conſequence of this defect is to make the expreſſion of the language obſcure and ambiguous.—Examples of this.*

I come now to conſider the words in Latin as ſignificant. And here it will appear that the Latin is as inferior to the Greek in ſenſe and expreſſion as in ſound. The moſt important part of ſpeech, as well as the moſt artificial, is the verb; and in it the Latin is moſt deficient. For, in the *firſt* place, it has but one paſt perfect time in the active voice, ſuch as *amavi*, but which cannot expreſs whether that perfect action be now preſent or not; ſo that it does not make the diſtinction which the Greeks do by their praeterperfect and by their praeterite indefinite, or aoriſt, for both which *amavi* ſtands *. And hence undoubtedly muſt ariſe an ambiguity, which cannot be reſolved by the words, but only by the ſenſe, or by repeating the verb in another tenſe, and ſaying, *amavi* et *amo*. And I obſerve

* Of the diſtinction betwixt the aoriſt and praeterperfect, ſee what I have ſaid Vol. ii. p. 132. *et ſeq.* The whole chapter is worth reading by thoſe who are not contented with having learned what is called *accidence* in the Engliſh ſchools, but deſire to underſtand the ſcience of the language, of which the knowledge of the doctrine of the tenſes is, I think, one of the moſt difficult parts.

that Horace, in one paſſage, has been obliged to uſe both tenſes, where he ſays,

Manſerunt hodieque *manent* veſtigia ruris *.

Now this plainly ſhows an imperfection in the language. And accordingly, in the more perfect Greek language, *amavi* is expreſſed as clearly by one word, πεφιληκα, and even in Engliſh, by the words *I have loved*, expreſſing, without any ambiguity, not only that I loved in the time paſt, but that I continue to love, and do now love. In the ſame manner, inſtead of the *manent* and *manſerunt* of Horace, the Greeks would have uſed a ſingle word, μεμενηκασι.

Again, the Latins, in their active verbs, have not a paſt participle active, whereas the Greeks have two, ſuch as φιλησας and πεφιληκως, expreſſing the paſt time either definitely or indefinitely, as above explained; the conſequence of which is, that the Latins of neceſſity are obliged to uſe that disjointed gaping compoſition, called the ablative abſolute, which

* Epiſt. I. Lib. ii. Verſ. 160.

the Greeks uſe only ſome times by way of variety.

Further, as the Latins want a paſt participle active, ſo they want a preſent participle paſſive; for they have no word that expreſſes φιλουμενος; nor will an ablative abſolute do the buſineſs here. They are therefore reduced to hard ſhifts. Virgil, in place of it, uſes the paſt participle paſſive, and ſays, *ventoſa per aequora vectis* *; and in another place he ſays, *eliſos oculos* †. And Cicero, in place of the preſent participle paſſive, borrows a preſent participle

* *Georgic.* I. v. 206. where *vectis* expreſſes the Greek word πορευομενοις.

† *Æneid.* VIII. v. 261. where Virgil, deſcribing Hercules ſtrangling Cacus, ſays,

——— Angit inhaerens
Eliſos oculos. ———

Here, if the Latins had had a preſent participle paſſive, ſuch as the Greeks have, of the verb *elido*, Virgil would have ſaid *elidomenos oculos*, that is, *eyes in the act of being thruſt out.*

from the active voice, and says, *marinis invehens belluis* *.

Besides this want of a participle in the passive voice, there is the same confusion in it of the aorist and praeterperfect that there is in the active, though at first sight it would appear that these two tenses are as much distinguished in the passive voice as they are in Greek; and I once believed it was so, though, in the common grammars, *amatus est* and *amatus fuit* are set down as in the same tense. But the Professor above mentioned, Mr Hunter, who, as the Latin tongue is his profession, is exceedingly learned in it, has shown me that they are truly the same, and that, in the best authors, they are used to denote indiscriminately either εφιληθη or πεφιληται, that is, either the aorist or the praeterperfect; in the same manner as *amavi* in the active voice signifies either of the two times; so that

* Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, Lib. i. Cap. 28. where *invehens* would have been *invehementus*, if the Latins had used such a form of the verb.

amatus eſt, as well as *amatus fuit*, may be applied to a paſt event, which in no ſenſe can be ſaid to be now preſent; and therefore they are both uſed without diſtinction as the hiſtoric tenſe, in the ſame manner as the aoriſt in Greek. Now, one ſhould think that *amatus eſt*, being compounded of the paſt participle *amatus*, and the verb *eſt* in the preſent tenſe, muſt denote a time compounded of the paſt and the preſent, that is, the *praeterperfect*: And that *amatus fuit*, being compounded of the paſt participle and a verb in the paſt time, muſt denote an action altogether paſt, but not preſent in any ſenſe: And, if the Latin language had been formed like the Greek, by philoſophers, or men of learning in the ſcience of language, I think it is impoſſible that expreſſions ſo different could have denoted the ſame time: And accordingly Mr Hunter thought at firſt, as I did, that they denoted different times. And, indeed, it is impoſſible to think otherwiſe, if you are learned in the grammatical art, and not one of thoſe who have got by heart the declenſions and conjugations, and have read many Greek authors,

but know nothing of the ſcience of language, of whom I am afraid there is a great number. In the ſame manner, I thought that *amatus erat*, and *amatus fuerat*, ſignified different things; but now I am convinced that they ſtand for the ſame tenſe, though the one be compounded of a paſt participle with a verb in the imperfect tenſe, and the other of the ſame paſt participle with the pluſquamperfect tenſe.

Moreover, in the tenſes the Latins have, they want the variations which the Greeks have of the ſame tenſe. Thus, they have but one future, and one aoriſt, in place of two of each, which the Greeks have: And there is a third future which the Greeks have alſo, but of which the Latins know nothing, I mean the *paulo poſt futurum*. It is true, indeed, that the two aoriſts have the ſame ſignification; and I believe the ſame is the caſe of the three futures, being all tenſes, as well as the aoriſts, from themes now obſolete *; but they give a variety of

* See what I have ſaid of the two *aoriſts*, Vol. II. p. 147. and of the *paulo poſt futurum*, p. 131. of the ſame Volume.

flexion and termination, which makes the language much more copious, in ſound at leaſt, if not in ſignification.

Further, the Latin language wants not only ſo many tenſes which the Greek has, but alſo a mood, I mean the optative. And this I hold to be a capital defect. For, by the nature of things, there are four diſpoſitions of the mind relating to every verb, and which ought to be expreſſed by ſome variation of the word. The firſt is ſingly affirming, that is the *indicative* mood. The ſecond is commanding, viz. the *imperative*. The third is wiſhing or praying, that is the *optative*. And the laſt is that whereby we expreſs that the verb is not principal in the ſentence, but dependent upon another verb; this is done by what is called the *ſubjunctive* mood *. Now, the Latins expreſs both

* See what I have ſaid upon the ſubject of *moods*, Book i. Chap. 13. Vol. ii. p. 162. where I have given my reaſons why I do not number the infinitive among the moods.

theſe two laſt mentioned by the ſame mood, viz. the ſubjunctive: And, therefore, when they have a mind to diſtinguiſh the two ſignifications, and to expreſs only the wiſh, they are obliged to uſe another word, *utinam*; or, to expreſs it ſimply by the ſubjunctive, which may in ſome caſes occaſion an ambiguity.

But even theſe are not all the defects of the Latin language in the ſimple article of the verb; for, beſides wanting ſo many tenſes and a whole mood, they want a whole voice,—viz. the middle voice, by which is expreſſed the action of a verb, which has for its ſubject the perſon himſelf who ſpeaks, or ſomething that concerns him; a very intereſting part of the expreſſion of a verb. To ſupply this want, the Latins are forced to uſe prepoſitions and pronouns, or ſometimes they uſe active or neutral verbs in a middle ſenſe; and particularly I obſerve they uſe *verto* in that way, as where Livy ſays, ſpeaking of ſtage-plays, *Ludus in artem paulatim* verterat *.

* Lib. vii. Cap. ii.

I will mention, only in paſſing, the want of a dual number both in their verbs and nouns, though I think it a defect; as that additional number not only produces an additional flexion, and ſo makes the ſound of the language more rich, but it makes a very proper diſtinction betwixt unity and number, by marking the firſt ſtep towards number*. But I come now to mention the moſt capital defect of all in the Latin language, of ſuch importance, that it makes it a language almoſt unfit for reaſoning, at leaſt for very ſtrict philoſophical reaſoning. It is not a defect of any particular modifications or variations of any one part of ſpeech, ſuch as the verb, but it is the want of one part of ſpeech entirely, viz. the article, which even the barbarous modern languages have. Now this want is ſuch, that, in the Greek and Latin languages, or in any other which admits the ſame variety of compoſition, when you join two words together in a propoſition by the ſubſtantive verb, if there be no article, it is impoſſible to ſay which is the ſubject of the

* See what I have ſaid of the dual number, Vol. ii. p. 87.

propoſition, and which is the predicate. Thus, in that famous γνωμη or *Sententious ſaying*, of Juvenal,

Nobilitas ſola eſt atque unica *virtus*,

it is impoſſible to ſay from the words, whether he means, *that Virtue is the only nobility*, or *that Nobility is the only virtue*; and, indeed, according to our way of arranging the words, the latter is the ſenſe of them. Again, when Virgil ſays,

Saxa vocant Itali, mediis quae in fluctibus, *Aras* *,

it is impoſſible to know from the words, whether the ſtones were called *altars*, or the altars *ſtones*. Again, in a paſſage of Livy, where he gives an account of the origin of ſtage plays among the Romans, you cannot underſtand from the words he uſes, whether he means to ſay that *Hiſter* was called *Ludio* by the *Etruſcans*, or *Ludio Hiſter* †. In the in-

* Æneid. i. Verſ. 112.

† Livy, Book vii. Cap. 2. where, after telling us that the Romans had their firſt players from Tuſcany, but afterwards got players of their own, he adds, *Ver-*

ſtances I have mentioned, the ſenſe of the paſſage removes the ambiguity: But there is a paſſage in Horace where that is not the caſe; it is where he ſays,

> Dixeris egregie, *notum* ſi calida verbum
> Reddideris junctura *novum*——— †

where I really do not know whether a *known* word is to be rendered *new*, or a *new* word *known*, by a cunning junction.

The article, too, gives an emphaſis, and a kind of dignity to proper names, by informing us that they are names well known; and it ſerves alſo in place of a relative, letting us know that the thing or perſon was mentioned before *.

naculis artificibus, quia Hiſter Tuſco verbo Ludio vocabatur, nomen hiſtrionibus inditum.

* See what I have ſaid of the application of the *article* in Greek to proper names, Vol. 2. page 55. & ſeq. where I have ſhown, that the article, when applied to a proper name (for it is not always ſo), has a meaning, and is not, as it is ſuppoſed by ſome, a word altogether inſignificant, of which kind I believe there is no word in ſo perfect a language as the Greek.

CHAP. XI.

Of Compoſition in Latin—not different in variety of arrangement from the Greek. In ſome of the Latin poets greater variety of arrangement than in the Greek.—But in the proſe authors a tedious ſameneſs in the arrangement, by placing the verb laſt ſo often in the ſentence.—The want of particles, ſuch as the Greeks have, a great defect in the Latin compoſition.

HAVING conſidered ſingle words in Latin, both with reſpect to their ſound, and as ſignificant, I come now to ſpeak of them in compoſition, in which, as far as depends upon the arrangement, there cannot be much difference betwixt it and the Greek, or if there be any as to the

variety of arrangement, I think there is more of that at leaſt in ſome of the Latin authors than is to be found in Greek. Of this I ſhall ſay more in the next book, where I am to treat of Stile.

But, in their proſe compoſitions, there is a ſameneſs and uniformity, which does not appear to me to ariſe from the nature of their language, but certainly predominates very much in their hiſtories, and more or leſs in all their compoſitions. What I mean is the terminating their ſentences ſo often with a verb, and generally the governing verb in the ſentence. But of this likewiſe I ſhall ſay more when I come to treat of Stile.

But, beſides this defect in the Latin compoſition, there are wanting in it thoſe many connective particles, with which, as I have ſhown, the Greek abounds ſo much; and which, beſides connecting the ſenſe, give a flow to the compoſition, not to be found in any other language. Several of theſe I have already mentioned, and will not here repeat.

And ſo much for the Latin language; and, as I underſtand no other antient language, except the Greek and Latin, I will now ſpeak of ſome modern languages, beginning with the modern Greek.

CHAP. XII.

The words of the modern Greek the ſame for the greater part with thoſe of the antient—different in the pronunciation and grammar.—Of the ſound of the modern Greek—little variety in it.—Five letters ſounded the ſame way.—No diphthongs *or* aſpirates—*no* melody *or* rhythm, *but only* accents, *ſuch as ours.—They retain ſomething of the grammatical art—form ſome caſes and tenſes by flection—have genders and numbers in their nouns, and perſons and numbers in their verbs—but their grammar cannot be reduced to any rule.—The Engliſh pronunciation of the antient Greek very like to the pronunciation of the modern Greek—has all the faults that pronunciation can have—formerly it was ſtill worſe, as they neglected the quantity, and pronounced the accents*

as they do the accents in their own language.—A reformation may be made of the Engliſh pronunciation of the Greek, without much difficulty.—The advantage of the Scotch pronunciation.—The corruption and debaſement of the Greek language ſhould be a warning to other nations to preſerve their language, by the ſtudy of the grammatical art in the antient languages.

THE words of the modern Greek language are, for the greater part, the ſame with thoſe of the antient Greek; ſo that the difference betwixt the two languages is chiefly in the pronunciation, and the analogy. A man, therefore, who underſtands the antient language, may in a very ſhort time make himſelf maſter of the modern. This I know from my own experience; for, many years ago, I ſtudied the modern Greek New Teſtament, and, with the aſſiſtance of the old Greek Teſtament, in two or three days I made myſelf maſter of the little grammatical art that is now to be found in the

language. But what I am now to ſay of it, is not what I then learned, which I have forgot long ago, but it is from the information I have had from a friend of mine in London, Mr Paradiſe, whoſe native language the modern Greek may be ſaid to be, as he was born in *Theſſalonica*, now *Salonica*, being the ſon of a gentleman who was then our conſul in that place. And I take this opportunity of returning my thanks to him for the inſtruction I have got from him in this and ſeveral other things concerning the modern Greeks.

To begin with the ſound of the language; They have loſt even the ſound of two of their vowels, the η and υ, in place of which they have ſubſtituted the *i*. They have loſt alſo the uſe of the two diphthongs ει and οι; and theſe they alſo ſound as *i*; which ſound, therefore, holds the place of five in the antient Greek language, viz. ι, η, υ, ει, and οι. This makes a conſtant *iotaciſm* run through their whole pronunciation. Now, the ſound of this letter is weak and ſlender, an *exilis ſonus*, as the Latins call it;

and therefore it was never uſed by the antient Greeks in the termination of their nouns, excepting only in three, which Ariſtotle has mentioned *.

2*do*, They have loſt the ſound, not only of the two diphthongs above mentioned, ει and οι, which they confound with *Iota*, but of all the diphthongs, proper and improper; ſo that the ſound of their language is not ſwelled or raiſed by any compounded ſound of vowels.

3*tio*, Neither have they any aſpirated conſonants: They do not, therefore, pronounce the letters φ, χ, or θ; nay, they do not aſpirate even vowels.

4*to*, They have loſt the melody of the antient language altogether; and do not appear to have any idea of it any more than the unlearned among us.

* Poetic. Cap. 21. *in fine.*

But, *5to*, What is ſtill worſe, they have no longer any rhythm in their language, which makes it more barbarous than many of thoſe languages we call barbarous *. Their ſyllables, therefore, are all of an equal length, and only diſtinguiſhed from one another by what we call *accent*. And this diſtinction they take from the accentuation in the antient Greek books. Thus, for example, the word ἄνθρωπος having an acute accent upon the firſt ſyllable, they pronounce as we do many words in Engliſh, and make of it *ánthrŏpos*, neglecting entirely the quantity of the middle ſyllable.

Thus it appears that they have loſt all that variety of ſound in their language, which, as I have ſhown, was the greateſt beauty of the antient Greek pronunciation; and, having debaſed ſo much the ſound of it, we cannot ſuppoſe that they have preſerved its grammar, though they have retained more of that than could well have been expected, conſidering how

* See pag. 18. of this volume.

much they have loſt of their language in other reſpects; for they ſtill form two caſes by flection, viz. the genitive and accuſative; and they have genders and numbers both in their ſubſtantives and adjectives. They form ſeveral of their tenſes alſo by flection, and likewiſe the perſons and numbers of their verbs. But my friend informs me, that, in their declenſions and conjugations, they hardly follow any rule: So that they cannot be ſaid to have a grammatical art, though they practice ſomething belonging to the art of their antient language.

Before I leave this ſubject of the modern Greek, I cannot help obſerving that the Engliſh pronunciation of the antient Greek is much too like to that of the modern, particularly in the pronunciation of the η and the ει diphthong, both which they ſound like the antient *Iota*, and alſo the ε, which they do not diſtinguiſh from the η by the ſound, but only by the quantity; and ſometimes they alſo pronounce the *Iota* in the ſame way; though more commonly they pronounce it as they do it in their

own language, that is, like the diphthong *ai*. And I muſt be forgiven if I ſay further, that the Engliſh pronunciation of the Greek has every fault that pronunciation can have; for they pronounce the ſame letter in different ways, as in the inſtance juſt now mentioned of the *Iota*. 2*dly*, They pronounce different letters the ſame way. Thus, as I have obſerved, they pronounce the three letters ε, η, and αι, and ſometimes *Iota* in the ſame way. They alſo confound in the pronunciation the ſimple υ and the ευ diphthong, and likewiſe the ſimple κ, and the aſpirated κ or χ. And, laſtly, there are ſounds in the Greek language, which they do not pronounce at all, ſuch as the diphthong ου, which they do not pronounce, not having ſuch a ſound in their own language, but confound it with another diphthong quite different, viz. αυ. And there is even a ſimple vowel, that they do not pronounce, viz. υ, which, from the deſcription the Halicarnaſſian gives us of its pronunciation *, ought to be ſounded like the French *u*. Nay, the firſt

* Περι συνθεσεως cap. 14.

of the vowels A they do not pronounce as the antient Greeks did, but as they generally pronounce their own A, that is, like the Greek H. So that according to the Engliſh pronunciation, the Greek wants the beſt ſounding of all the vowels, if we can truſt the judgment of the Halicarnaſſian *.

* Περι συνθεσεως, *ibid.* The mechaniſm of its pronunciation he thus deſcribes, λεγεται ανοιγομενου του στοματος επι πλειστον, και του πνευματος ἀνωφερομενου προς τον ουρανον.——So that by not opening their mouth ſufficiently, the Engliſh make their pronunciation of the Greek as faulty, as Milton obſerves the pronunciation of their own language is.—See Milton's *Tractate of Education*; He ſays, that the ſpeech of the ſcholar 'ſhould be faſhioned to a diſtinct clear pronunci-'ation, as near as may be to the Italian, eſpecially in 'the vowels. For we Engliſhmen, being northerly, 'do not open our mouths in the cold air wide enough 'to grace a Southern tongue; but are obſerved by all 'other nations, to ſpeak exceeding cloſe and inward: 'So that to ſmatter Latin with an Engliſh mouth, is 'as ill a hearing, as Law French.' I would recommend the whole treatiſe to the Reader, as the beſt thing both for matter and ſtile, that has been written upon the ſubject of education, in modern times.

Thus, I think I have ſhown that the Engliſh pronunciation of the Greek, has all the three faults I have mentioned, that is, every fault which pronunciation can have; the conſequence of this is, that, in their pronunciation, a great part of that variety of ſound, which, as I have obſerved, diſtinguiſhes ſo much the Greek from other languages, is loſt; and by making much uſe of that weak ſlender ſound *Iota*, they debaſe the ſound of the language very near as much as the modern Greeks do.

Their pronunciation, however, formerly was ſtill much worſe than it is at preſent, and ſtill more reſembling the modern Greek pronunciation; for they pronounced it according to the accents, as marked in the Greek books, by raiſing the voice upon the ſyllables that were marked with the acute accent, without any regard to the quantity; or, in other words, accenting the Greek juſt as they do their own language; by which means they ſounded the accented ſyllable as if it were long,

though it may be ſhort. This fault, ſo great that it deſtroys entirely the meaſure of the Greek verſe, they have now corrected; and they pronounce according to the *quantity*, neglecting the accents altogether, for a very good reaſon—that they cannot pronounce them; and, indeed, I believe very few, even of the ſcholars in England, have any idea how they ſhould be pronounced. There are ſtill remaining, however, ſome veſtiges in certain words, of the barbarity of this ancient pronunciation, as in the name of the Iſland *St Heléna*, which being accented upon the penult ſyllable, they make that ſyllable long: And in the word *Idèa*, they lengthen the ſame ſyllable for the ſame reaſon, and I have obſerved the like in other words, which I do not at preſent recollect.

The Engliſh reader will forgive me for theſe obſervations upon the faults and defects of the pronunciation of Greek in England, as I think it is a pity that a nation, which underſtands the Greek ſo well, ſhould pronounce it ſo ill; and I hope, that, as they have already corrected one

great fault in their pronunciation, they will alſo correct others. The reformation muſt begin at ſchool, where I ſhould not think that it would be difficult to introduce a new method of pronunciation: And, if any of the maſters of thoſe ſchools have any doubt of the truth of my obſervations upon their preſent pronunciation, I refer them to Dionyſius the Halicarnaſſian, in his treatiſe *upon Compoſition*, where he deſcribes, mechanically, the pronunciation of each letter. Our pronunciation in Scotland comes very near, as I have obſerved elſewhere *, to the deſcription he gives of that of the ancient Greeks: But, though it be not the ſame, it has clearly this advantage over the Engliſh pronunciation, that it diſtinguiſhes every letter from another, and ſounds every one of them: So that, in the Scotch pronunciation, no part of the variety of the ancient ſound of the language is loſt.——The benefit of this diſtinctneſs of our pronunciation, I have myſelf experienced; for there were ſeveral years of my life, when thro' a weakneſs of my eyes, I read no Greek

* Vol. II. pag. 237. 238.

at all, but had it read to me. Now, if it had been read to me with the Engliſh pronunciation, ſuppoſe I had been accuſtomed to that pronunciation, I could not have underſtood it by the ſound of ſo many letters being comfounded, and ſome not founded at all.

Before I conclude this chapter, upon the ſubject of modern Greek, I cannot help obſerving, how much ſo noble a people as the Greeks have degenerated, and loſt thoſe arts in which they excelled all the world, even that art of the greateſt uſe and moſt conſtant practice, the art of ſpeech. This art the Greeks have loſt, not by getting another language in place of their own, which has happened to ſome, (for the words of their language, with the exceptions of very few, are all Greek), but by loſing the grammatical art, and ſo far returning to barbarity, as to ſpeak a barbarous language, in place of the politeſt and moſt cultivated language that ever was ſpoken. Their example ſhould be a warning to other nations, not to neglect the

ſtudy of the ancient languages, where only the grammatical art is to be learned, and by the imitation of which, they may improve, or at leaſt preſerve from becoming worſe, their own language.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the sound *of the Engliſh language.—It conſiſts chiefly of monoſyllables.--The words crouded with conſonants, and many terminated with the aſpirated* t.*—This fault of the language aggravated by modern uſe. —No* melody or rhythm *in the Engliſh language.—The words and ſyllables, at the ſame time pronounced with a great variety of* tones*; but theſe not reduced to any rule.--The wonderful art of the Greek language in this reſpect.—Of* accents *in Engliſh.—They give a variety to the pronunciation of the language, and make our verſification more various and beautiful than that of other modern nations.--The abuſe of our modern accents in our modern uſe of them.—Not to be compared, though ever ſo properly uſed, to the rhythm of Greek and Latin.—The words in Engliſh conſidered as ſignificant.—In this reſpect, the language is ſtill more inferior to the*

Greek and Latin, particularly in the verb. *The* time *of it not expreſſed, except by one flexion of the word; nor the* numbers *except in one inſtance.—Defective alſo in the expreſſion of* perſons.—*We had once a* mood *expreſſed by the termination; but that is now loſt.—Only two* participles *expreſſed by termination.—The Engliſh more defective ſtill in* voices, *than in tenſes or moods.—No* middle voice.—*And no tenſe, mood, or participle in the* paſſive voice, *expreſſed by flexion.—The clumſy circumlocutions that we are obliged to uſe to ſupply the defects of the paſſive voice.—As to* nouns *in Engliſh, they have no genders nor caſes, and therefore may be reckoned indeclinable words. —The compoſition alſo of words very defective in Engliſh; and alſo the etymology, as it is not an original language.*

THE next modern language I ſhall mention, is our own language, the Engliſh; and I will conſider it as I have done other languages, beginning with the ſound of it.

The words are, for the greater part, monoſyllables, except thoſe of Greek or Roman extraction. Then they are crouded with conſonants, and the aſpirated *t* is much uſed, even in the end of words. Now, one cannot well conceive a harſher, or more abrupt ſound than a monoſyllable, ſuch as we have many concluding with a—*th*. It is a ſound that could not be endured by a Greek or Roman ear, and cannot be pronounced by a Frenchman or Italian. The moſt of our words conclude with mute conſonants, ſuch as *b*, *d*, *g*, ſometimes a little ſoftened by the addition of an *e* at the end; this muſt make the ſound of the language exceeding harſh and rough, compared with the Greek, or even with the Latin, the voice being ſo often interrupted by ſo many ſtops betwixt words, and the mouth ſo often ſhut by thoſe final mute conſonants, and by the * termination with *m*. This fault of the language, is not at all mended by the mo-

* See what Milton ſays upon this ſubject, pag. 104. of this volume.

dern uſe, but, on the contrary, is aggravated; for we ſometimes ſhorten our words, by throwing out a ſyllable in the middle, thus of the triſyllable *Every*, we make a diſyllable *Ev'ry*, and the only tenſe we form by flexion, *viz.* the perfect active, we commonly curtail of its laſt ſyllable—Thus of *Loved*, as our forefathers pronounced, we make a monoſyllable *Lov'd*; and of *Builded*, as the word is uſed in our Bible, we make *Built*.

Further, the Engliſh language is altogether unmuſical, unleſs we are pleaſed to call a drum a muſical inſtrument—For it has no melody, that is tones, differing in acuteneſs and gravity upon different ſyllables, nor has it rhythm; for though it have ſome long ſyllables, they bear no proportion in number to the ſhort, nor is the ratio betwixt them and the ſhort fixed, without which there can be no rhythm; all therefore we have for both the melody and rhythm of the Greeks and Latins, is, that we ſound one ſyllable of a word louder than the reſt, and ſo make a mixture of

loud and ſoft ſounds, ſuch as we obſerve in a drum.

But tho' we have no fixed or regulated tones upon our ſyllables of words, we are not for that to imagine that we pronounce them all with the ſame tone. Even in a drum, there is ſome variety of tones, according as the ſtroke is given nearer to, or farther from the centre. And as to ſpeaking, a man muſt have a very nice ear, and much practice, to be able to ſpeak a ſingle ſentence to an end in a perfect monotony. This, indeed, deaf perſons who have been taught to ſpeak, do without any art, and neceſſarily; for not ſpeaking by the ear, as we do, but mechanically, it is impoſſible that they can have any idea or practice of variety of tones.

And here we may obſerve, with what wonderful art the pronunciation of the Greek language has been formed; for the Greeks contrived to reduce to rule that infinite variety of tones with which modern languages are pronounced, and at the ſame time that they have preſcribed

rules for their accents, they have given them all the variety that is poſſible; for every ſyllable in a Greek word is ſounded either with an acute accent, a grave, or with both; and beſides theſe nothing, to uſe a phraſe of Ariſtotle*.—Such being the art of the Greek language, I do not much wonder that it is not comprehenſible by thoſe who are but ordinary ſcholars, and ſo unlearned in the hiſtory and philoſophy of man, as to judge of ancient men and arts by what they ſee in modern times.—But to return to our accents.

Such as they are, they give, I think, a beauty and variety to our pronunciation, which our neighbours the French have not in their language; for they have neither accent nor rhythm: And we are thereby enabled to make much better verſe than the French, and of greater beauty and variety, than is to be found in any other modern language, that I know, or have heard of, the Italian only excepted.—Of this verſification I have given a ſyſtem in

* Και παρα ταυτα ουδεν.

the ſecond volume of this work, which the reader, if he think it worth his while, may conſult; and if he can deviſe a better, I ſhall think myſelf obliged to him if he would communicate it to me or the public.——But as, by our modern pronunciation, we aggravate the defect of length in our words, ſo, by a faulty pronunciation, which is increaſing every day, we are taking from the beauty of our accents, by drawing them too far back, even to the third ſyllable, and ſo obſcuring the pronunciation of the two final ſyllables.—Thus a great many pronounce *Révenue*, in place of *Revénue*, where it is evident, that the two laſt ſyllables of the word are obſcured by the firſt ſyllable being accented.—Again, people now generally ſay, *Advértiſement* in place of *Advertiſement*, as they formerly pronounced; by which two long ſyllables are ſunk in the pronunciation.—Again, almoſt every body now ſays, *cómmendable* in place of *comméndable*, by which I think, the rhythm of a very fine period in Milton is ſpoiled *.

* In Vol. iii. p. 51. the reader will find this period reſtored.

—Nay, we endeavour to draw back the accent, even beyond the third ſyllable; thus we ſay, *Intereſted.*—But this being impoſſible by the nature of things, we are obliged to lay ſome ſtreſs upon the laſt ſyllable, *ted.*

But ſuppoſe our accents more varied and oftener laid upon the penult, or laſt ſyllable, we muſt not imagine that they could ever be made ſo agreeable to the ear as the long and ſhort ſyllables of the antients, not to mention their proſody*, that is, the muſical tones of their ſyllables.—For the variety of long and ſhort in a certain ratio to one another, is true rhythm, and much more pleaſant to a muſical ear, than any other compoſition of ſounds, where there is no difference but of *loud* and *ſoft*, the ratio of which to one another cannot be appretiated; and accordingly, in muſic, tho' there be that difference likewiſe, the length and ſhortneſs of the notes compared toge-

* See what I have ſaid of the abuſe of this word by our modern grammarians,—Vol. ii. p. 269.—271.

ther is the chief beauty, without which there is no muſic of any value; and accordingly, in our notation of muſic, it is as carefully marked as the tones, and is ſo eſſential to muſic, that we cannot conceive muſic without it.—And hence the common ſaying among the antients, 'That rhythm was every thing in muſic*'—And I am perſuaded, that it was chiefly by the rhythm that the antient muſic produced ſuch wonderful effects aſcribed to it; for the rhythm of a tune is the motion of it.—Now, it is well known, how much motion perceived either by the eye or ear affects the human mind; and indeed the motions of the body, or of the features of the face, are the index of all our ſentiments and paſſions.

Before I quit this ſubject of Engliſh accent, I muſt obſerve, that the poverty of our language is ſo great, that we often employ the ſame word to expreſs both a verb, and a ſubſtantive or adjective. Now, ac-

* Παν παρα τοις μουσικοις ο ρυθμος.

cording to the common uſe of the language in my younger days, the verb was diſtinguiſhed from the noun by the accent being put upon the laſt ſyllable of the verb, and the firſt ſyllable of the noun. But at preſent this is neglected. Thus, for example, they ſaid formerly, *a ſúbject*, and *to be ſubjéct*, but they always ſaid *to ſubjéct*. Now, many people ſay, *to ſúbject;* nay I have heard *ſúbjected* ſaid, though with the greateſt violation to the quantity; by which, a ſyllable naturally long by poſition, is almoſt quite obſcured in the pronunciation.

I come now to ſpeak of the words in Engliſh as ſignificant, and there it will be found ſtill more inferior to the learned languages, by how much the ſenſe is ſuperior to the ſound.—I will begin with the verb, the principal part of ſpeech, expreſſing the actions and energies of things, by which only we know their nature.—The great artifice of the learned languages is, to expreſs ſeveral things neceſſarily belonging to the verb, by changes made upon the word, without creating new words. One

neceſſary concomitant of all action is time. Now we have ſeen how ingeniouſly the learned languages, and particularly the Greek, expreſſes that by the flexion of the word; in place of which, the Engliſh mark only one tenſe by the flexion or termination of the word, (for the *preſent* I do not reckon a *tenſe*, any more than the *nominative* a *caſe**), viz. the indefinite preterite, *I loved*, a defect very clumſily ſupplied by what is called auxiliary verbs.—The next thing to be conſidered is number, a thing alſo eſſential to the action of the verb; for the actors muſt be one or many.—Now, this is not at all expreſſed in Engliſh by any change upon the verb, except in the 3d perſon of the preſent of the indicative; for they ſay *I love*, *they love*, *I lov'd*, *they*

* See what I have ſaid upon the ſubject of *Caſes*, Vol. ii. p. 93. And as to *Tenſes*, Ariſtotle calls them the πτωσεις ῥηματος, as he does the caſes the πτωσεις ονοματος. Ariſtotle's *poetics*, cap. 20. So that it appears he did not reckon the *preſent*, from which all the tenſes are derived, a *Tenſe*, any more than the *nominative* a *caſe*.

lov'd; but in the 3d perſon of the preſent, they diſtinguiſh the numbers; for they ſay *he loves*, but *they love*.

The next thing is to expreſs Perſons, whether it be the firſt, ſecond, or third, that acts. Now, here there is ſomething pretty extraordinary in the Engliſh verb; for in the ſingular number of the preſent, each of the three perſons is marked by different terminations of the word: Thus we ſay, *I love*, *thou loveſt*, *he loveth*, or *loves*, as we are now pleaſed to contract it into one ſyllable, not having, as it would ſeem, monoſyllables enough in our language. And in the ſingular number of the preterite tenſe we mark one perſon by a change of the termination: Thus we ſay, *thou lovedſt*; but we ſay, *I loved*, and *he loved*. But, in the plural number in both tenſes, we mark all the perſons by the ſame termination. For we ſay, *we love*, *ye love*, and *they love*; *we loved*, *ye loved*, and *they loved*. This defect is ſupplied by a conſtant repetition of the pronoun.

As to Moods, we had once in Engliſh a ſubjunctive mood, marked by the termination; but this termination was no other than the termination of the firſt perſon of the preſent of the indicative, without any variation of the other perſons. Thus Milton ſays, *if I love*, *if thou love*, *if he love*. But this mood is, ſince his time, almoſt quite out of faſhion; tho' we have ſo little variation in our verbs, that I think not the leaſt ſhould be loſt. The defect here is alſo ſupplied by auxiliary verbs.

As to Participles, we have but two, marked by the termination, the preſent active, and the paſt paſſive. The preſent ends in *ing*, as *loving*; but, with reſpect to the paſt, ſuch is the tedious ſimilarity of our terminations, that it has no other termination but that of the preterite active tenſe.

We have, however, with the aſſiſtance of our auxiliary verb *have*, one participle which the Latins have not,—an active paſt participle,—ſuch as *having loved*, the want of which, as I have obſerved *, the Latins

* Page 84.

ſupply by the disjointed gapeing compoſition of an ablative abſolute *.

* I have often wondered how it comes, that the tranſlators of our Bible avail themſelves ſo little of this advantage, which the language affords them, particularly in the tranſlation of the New Teſtament, where I cannot find one inſtance of that participle being uſed; —for inſtead of ſaying, *Having done this, he went away*, they uſe a circumlocution and ſay, *when he had done this, he went away*, or *he did this, and went away*. And ſometimes without any circumlocution, they uſe the *preſent* participle active, in place of the *paſt*, as in the 10th verſe of the xviith chapter of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, they tranſlate the paſt participle, παραγενομενοι by the preſent Engliſh participle *coming*, inſtead of *having come*.

It may be here obſerved, that, as the Latins ſupply the want of a preſent participle paſſive, by uſing the paſt participle paſſive, as I have noticed p. 85. ſo they ſupply the want of a paſt participle active by the uſe of the preſent participle active. Thus Virgil ſays,

Ipſe, nemus *linquens* patrium, ſaltuſque Lycaei,
" Pan ovium cuſtos, tua ſi tibi Maenala curae,
" Adſis O Tegeae favens———"

Georg. lib. i. v. 16.

where *linquens* is plainly λιπων in Greek. In the ſame way in proſe, Suetonius ſays, " Cicerone in judicio quo-

As to Voices, the poverty of the language is ſtill greater than in any inſtance I have mentioned. For beſides the want of a middle voice, a defect which is common to us with the Latin, there is not one tenſe, number, perſon, mood, or participle in the paſſive voice, formed by any flexion of the word, but all by auxiliary verbs prefixed to the preterite active, which ſerves the ſeveral purpoſes of marking that tenſe, all the paſſive tenſes, and alſo the participle active paſt, and the participle paſſive paſt.

But even with the aſſiſtance of theſe auxiliaries, there are ſome tenſes in this voice that cannot be expreſſed but by a very aukward circumlocution. Thus *edificatur*, we can expreſs no otherwiſe but

" dam *deplorante* temporum ſtatum, P. Clodium inimicum " ejus fruſtra jam pridem a patribus ad plebem tranſire " nitentem, eodem die horaque tranſduxit Caeſar,"—Vitae C. Jul. Caeſaris, cap. 20. where Caſaubon very well obſerves, that *deplorante* is *cum deploraſſet*, or in Greek, not ολοφυρομενου, but ολοφυραμενου, that is, *having deplored.*——See the whole note of Caſaubon, which is very well worth the reading.

by saying, *it is in building*, or, as we commonly express it, but without any regard to propriety, *a-building*. Again, *edificabatur* we can express no other way but by *was in building*, or *a-building*. And we are deficient, as well as the Latins are, in a present participle passive; for we cannot express the Greek participle, *οικοδομουμενος*, otherwise than by the clumsy circumlocution of *being in building*.—And so much for the verb in English.

To the Noun belong genders, numbers, and cases, all marked by flexion in the learned languages. But, in English there are no genders, either of substantives or adjectives, no numbers of adjectives, but only of substantives, marked sometimes by a change of the word, as *man*, *men*, but much more commonly by the addition of *s* to the termination of the singular. But of no nouns, either in the singular or plural number, are there cases; so that the noun in English may be reckoned an indeclinable word, except as to the pronouns, *I*, *thou*, and *he*, which admit greater changes than any other words in English; for they

are remarkably changed both as to caſe and number.

As to the Article *the*, it admits of no change, tho' I believe the Engliſh language is the only one that has an indeclinable article.

And thus much for the Flexion of the Engliſh language. As to the other two great artifices of language, Compoſition and Derivation, it is equally defective. With regard to compoſition, our harſh monoſyllables do not ſo eaſily run together, and coaleſce into one word as the Greek or even the Latin words; and therefore the genius of the language admits but very little compoſition, except in words of Greek or Latin origin; and there is one compoſition which I have ſhown * has ſo fine an effect in Greek, I mean compoſition with prepoſitions, one or more, which is almoſt totally wanting in Engliſh.

As to Derivation or Etymology.—The Engliſh language not being an original

* Page 53.

language like the Greek, but a derived language, and even the third in deſcent from the Gothic, and both the Gothic and its immediate parent the Saxon being unknown to us, we hardly know the etymology of any word purely Engliſh.

CHAP. XIV.

Of Engliſh compoſition of words in ſentences.—The defect of it compared with the Greek and Latin compoſition.—The want of variety of arrangement in it.—Examples of this from Horace's ode to Pyrrha, tranſlated by Milton.—Milton, in his proſe ſtile as well as verſe, has all the variety of arrangement that the language will admit.—The preſent arrangement, like the French, in what is called the natural order.—Our compoſition cannot be ſufficiently diverſified, otherwiſe than by compoſition in periods.—Milton's Latin ſtile compoſed of very fine periods.—In his Engliſh proſe, the language does not permit him to vary his ſtile ſo much; very different, however, from the faſhionable ſtile at preſent.—An account of that ſtile.—It is of two different kinds.

THUS much of ſingle words in Engliſh, conſidered both with regard to their ſound and their ſenſe.—I am now to conſider the compoſition of them in ſentences. In which, how defective a language muſt be, that wants genders, numbers, and caſes, every ſcholar muſt know that underſtands Greek and Latin, and at the ſame time knows the ſcience of language, which I doubt is not the caſe of every man who thinks himſelf a Greek and Latin ſcholar. Beſides the tireſome repetition of thoſe monoſyllables, by which we form our caſes, and of our auxiliary verbs, by which we form our tenſes, ſuch as, *have*, *ſhall*, *will*, and *can*—*had*, *ſhould*, *would*, and *could*, occurring ſo frequently, the want of numbers, genders, and caſes formed by flexion, forbids almoſt all variety of arrangement, the great beauty, as we have ſeen, of the antient compoſition, and obliges us to connect our words in ſyntax by juxta-poſition only. To be convinced how contemptible a compoſition this is, compared with the Greek and

Latin, let him read Horace's ode to Pyrrha, and then Milton's tranſlation of it, as near as poſſible, not only to the words, but to the arrangement of them, nearer indeed, than the ſtinted genius of our language will admit; and then he will clearly ſee how much more beautiful and elegant, as well as ſhorter, the Latin arrangement is. It is ſo various, that, in the firſt ſtanza, hardly two words that are conſtrued together ſtand together *.

* The firſt ſtanza runs thus.

Quis multa gracilis te puer in roſa
Perfuſus liquidis urget odoribus
Grato, Pyrrha, ſub antro?

where we may obſerve, that the only words conſtrued together and placed together, are the prepoſitions *in* and *ſub*; which, being indeclinable words, cannot be otherwiſe connected with the words they govern, except by juxta-poſition. The tranſlation, Milton has given us of this ode, was, I am perſuaded, intended to ſhow how inferior, in point of compoſition, the Engliſh was to the Latin; for, in the tranſlation of the line,

Qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea,

As much, however, of variety of arrangement as the language will admit, ſo much I think we ſhould uſe. And accordingly Milton has done ſo in his proſe, as well as verſe, which gives his proſe a caſt and colour very different from what is faſhionable at preſent among us; for we arrange every thing as the French do, in what we call the Natural Order *, but which is cer-

into the Engliſh,

Who now enjoys thee, credulous, all gold,

he muſt have underſtood that the word *credulous*, muſt apply to *thee*, as well as the words *all gold*; whereas in the Latin it is clear, from the genders and caſes, that *credulus* applies to the lover, and *aurea* to the miſtreſs. And, in the next verſe of the tranſlation,

Who always vacant, always amiable,
Hopes thee, of flattering gales unmindful,

it is evident, that according to our method of arrangement by juxta-poſition, *always vacant*, *always amiable*, and likewiſe the words, *of flattering gales unmindful*, muſt apply to the lover, and not to the miſtreſs.

* See what I have ſaid of this Natural Order of arrangement, as it is called, Vol. II. B. III. Ch. 2.

tainly moſt tireſomely uniform. And becauſe Milton does not follow that order, we ſay his proſe is harſh and uncouth, tho' we cannot ſay that it is obſcure, nor conſequently, that he has done any violence to the Language.

But this variety of arrangement, in a Language ſo inartificial as ours, can go but ſhort way in diverſifying the compoſition; and, therefore, as we have neither rhythm nor melody, nor that variety of flexion and termination which we find in the learned Languages, there is no other way remaining, by which we can give any diverſity to our ſtile, except by compoſition in periods conſiſting of different members of various lengths and variouſly connected together, with a different ſtructure of the words, and, what I think is neceſſary to make the period perfectly beautiful, a variety of matter in the ſeveral members. This laſt mentioned variety is particularly agreeable in ſpeaking, as it is gives occaſion to a change of the tone of the voice; which, if it be well executed, is moſt pleaſant to the ear, at the

ſame time, that it conveys the ſenſe better than it could be otherwiſe conveyed. And for the ſame reaſon, *Parentheſis* is a moſt beautiful figure of Compoſition.

In this way, Milton compoſes in Latin, particularly, in his *Defenſio pro Populo Anglicano*, where there is a variety and beauty of Compoſition of the kind I have mentioned, not exceeded, hardly equalled, by any Latin author, with the variety, however, of ſhort commatic ſentences thrown in here and there; for the fineſt things muſt not be too often repeated. In Engliſh, the language not permitting, he has been more ſparing in this highly varied compoſition, but enough of it to make his ſtile paſs for very rough and unpleaſant to thoſe who are not claſſical ſcholars, and are accuſtomed to the ſtile now in faſhion, of a colour and complexion perfectly different, where there is either that broken disjointed compoſition, hardly deſerving the name of compoſition, and which is worſe ſtill in Engliſh than it is in the Latin of Salluſt, Seneca, or Tacitus;—or, if it be compoſed in periods, it is in periods

of two, or perhaps three members, of the ſame ſtructure of words, inartificially tacked together by the copulative; and, in ſome late authors, who affect to diſtinguiſh themſelves by the beauty of their ſtile, the period is tagged with two nouns, and each its attendant epithet. Such compoſition, I think, is worſe than no compoſition; and therefore I prefer the ſtile of the authors I have mentioned, and their modern imitators in French or Engliſh, who cut their ſtile into ſhreds and patches, to thoſe who compoſe in ſo bad a taſte.——I will only add, that, however rough and unpleaſant Milton's ſtile may appear to the faſhionable reader, I would nethertheleſs adviſe him to ſtudy his Polemical writings, both Political and Theological, if not for the ſtile, at leaſt for the matter; for he will find there a variety of argument, with which his moſt extenſive learning, antient and modern, ſacred and prophane, furniſhed him, ſuch as, I think, is not to be found in any other modern author.

CHAP. XV.

The French Language inferior to the Engliſh in Sound, having neither accent nor quantity —It is a fault in ſpeaking French to mark any accent.—They have no perceptible difference in the quantity of their ſyllables.—This makes their verſification very imperfect, compared with the Engliſh. —Their long verſe particularly, moſt tireſomely uniform.—The French words not ſo much crowded with Conſonants as the Engliſh, but wanting aſpirates too much. —The Grammar of the French Language more complete than of ours, having much more flexion,—but of this they do not avail themſelves in their compoſition at preſent; but did ſo formerly, particularly in their Verſe.

I Come now to ſpeak of the French Language, which I think, in point of ſound, is much inferior to the Engliſh; for it has neither Accent (I mean what we call Accent) nor Quantity. As to accent, it is a rule among the French, that *good ſpeaking muſt be without accent* *; and they do not diſtinguiſh a Britiſh man, who has not learned to ſpeak the French well, by any thing ſooner, than by his accenting one ſyllable of a word more than another. And this property of their language, I am perſuaded, they have derived from their mother language, the Latin; in which there was not, any more than in the Greek, as I have already obſerved †, and ſhall further obſerve, any ſuch thing as what we call Accent. As to quantity, the Engliſh have certainly ſome ſyllables in their language longer than others, but not in ſuch proportion to the

* *Pour parler bien, il faut parler ſans accent.*

† P. 40. of this Volume.

ſhort in point of number, nor with the ratio in point of quantity ſo fixed that we can make verſe of them, tho' I think they give a variety and beauty to the pronunciation both of our proſe and verſe. But as to the French, I can hardly perceive that they have one ſyllable longer than another; which has made a Frenchman ſay, as I have obſerved elſewhere*, judging of all the modern Languages by his own, that there is no quantity in any modern language.—Now, the conſequence of their wanting both accent and quantity, is, that they can only make verſe by the rhyme and the number of ſyllables; whereas in Engliſh there is great variety of verſe, greater I believe, than in any modern language, the Italian only excepted.—The French long verſe particularly, conſiſting all of the ſame number of ſyllables, with the Caeſura always in the middle, and every two of them tagg'd with a rhyme, is to my ear moſt tireſomely uniform, tho' they attempt to give it ſome variety, by what they call male and female rhymes.

* Vol. ii. of this work, p. 322.

And the only verſe they have, which pleaſes my ear, is their ſhorter verſe, where the rhymes are alternate, and the number of ſyllables varied in the verſes.

All the advantage, therefore, they can claim over the Engliſh in point of ſound, is that their words are not ſo much crowded with conſonants as ours are, and they have more variety of terminations, ariſing from a cauſe, which I am juſt to mention. And they have no termination ſo harſh and uncouth, and which indeed only cuſtom could make us endure, as the termination by an aſpirated *t*. This aſpiration they want altogether, having it neither in the beginning, middle nor end of their words; but which, beſides the want of variety, makes the ſound of their language not ſo ſtrong and maſculine as that of ours.

As to their words conſidered as ſignificant, that is, the grammar of their language, they are certainly ſuperior to the Engliſh; for they have genders and numbers both for their nouns and adjectives, and they have more tenſes formed by flexion than

we have, for beſides the preſent and indefinite perfect, they have in the active voice the imperfect and the future formed in that way; and even their moods are diſtinguiſhed from one another by flexion; for the indicative, imperative, and ſubjunctive, have different terminations; and in the ſubjunctive there are two tenſes in that way diſtinguiſhed, the imperfect and the indefinite perfect.

From this advantage over us, one ſhould think their compoſition would be more various than ours, and conſequently better. And ſo it certainly ſhould be; but the fact is, that the modern French compoſition is worſe than even the worſt of ours; and there is a ſameneſs in it, that I really think intolerable; for it is all either cut into ſhort unconnected ſentences, as Monteſquieu writes; or, if the ſenſe be carried on thro' ſeveral lines without any full ſtop, the members of the ſentence conſiſt of a few words of the ſame form and ſtructure; and, if they be at all connected, it is only by the copulative *and*: Nor is the meaning ſuſpended till the end of the

ſentence, when it is brought out altogether compacted, and as it were embodied; which I hold to be eſſential to what is called a period.—In ſhort, there is not in the modern French writing, that roundneſs and circumſcription, which is the very definition of a period *. As to Parentheſis, by which, as I have obſerved elſewhere †, the ſtile is moſt beautifully variegated, I have read whole French books, in which there is not one Parentheſis from beginning to end.

* See this definition of a period, from Cicero, Vol. iii. of this work p. 57.——See alſo the following pages, 58. 59. 60. and 61. where the reader will find examples of periods compoſed as they ought to be.—See alſo what I have ſaid of the variety of compoſition in the learned languages, and how far it is capable of being imitated in Engliſh, Vol. ii. p. 354. and following.

† See Vol. iii. p. 72. and following; where I have juſtified the uſe of parentheſes, by the example of the beſt authors, and have ſhown, that a proper parentheſis not only gives an opportunity, to the ſpeaker, to vary his tone agreeably, but excites the attention of the hearer, and conveys the ſenſe more forcibly than it could be otherwiſe conveyed.

However tediouſly uniform, or *fade*, to uſe a word of their own, the French compoſition muſt appear to a ſcholar and a man of taſte, I am ſorry to obſerve, that a great part of our late compoſitions in Engliſh, are of the ſame colour and caſt; and, particularly with reſpect to Parentheſes, I heard it obſerved one day, by an Engliſh Gentleman, that there was not in all Mr Gibbon's Roman Hiſtory one parentheſis. This muſt neceſſarily be the caſe, if we forſake the antient ſtandards of fine writing, and imitate either modern French writers, or antient writers, but of an age, when the taſte of good writing was corrupted.

In the old French writers, there is a much greater variety of compoſition, and I obſerve, that they avail themſelves of the advantage, which a more perfect analogy than ours gives them in point of compoſition, particularly in their verſe; and therefore I prefer the old French Poetry, written in what they call the *Stile de Marot*, to the modern French poetry, except what

has been written in imitation of that ſtile, ſuch as the Tales and Fables of Fontaine, which I think are the beſt Poetry in French*.

The account I have here given of the French language, is I think favourable enough, as I prefer it in ſeveral reſpects to our own. But, if we believe ſome of their own writers, particularly the Abbé Auger, who has publiſhed tranſlations of Demoſthenes and Eſchines, in 5 vols octavo, with preliminary diſſertations, and particularly one upon the Greek, Latin, and French languages, the French language has every beauty that a language can have; and if *words*, *words*, as Shakeſpear ſays, could per-

* There is a fine eulogium upon Fontaine, by Voltaire, in his *Temple de Gout*, in the following words.

Toi, favori de la Nature,
Toi, la Fontaine auteur aimable
Qui, bravant et rime et meſure,
Si negligé dans ta parure,
N'en etoit que plus charmant.

ſuade us, he certainly would perſuade us. I have given the encomium below in his own words *.

* The properties he deſcribes to it are, 'Clartè, 'nettetè, vivacitè, dans les tours, force, dèlicateſſe, 'ſimplicitè, nobleſſe, douceur, preciſion, harmonie, 'et même harmonie imitative, elle mêt à tout avec 'aſſez de facilitè dans la compoſition, et juſques dans 'la traduction, quoi qu'avec plus de peine et de plus 'longs efforts.'—Vol. iii. p. 130.

Thus the French Abbe has inſtructed us in the beauties of his language, not in the old way, by dividing, defining, and analyſing, (which, to be ſure, he would think much below a man of his genius), but by multiplying words, very fine ones no doubt, as he thinks, but without any preciſe or determinate meaning. In the ſame way, he examines the merit of Demoſthenes, Æſchines, and Cicero, as orators.

CHAP. XVI.

Of the Italian Language.—The words of it long and full.—Of Vowels.—Few of their words terminated by Conſonants.—Their pronunciation therefore more flowing than either that of Engliſh or French.—They have accents ſuch as the Engliſh.—Make therefore Poetry of blank verſe.—Have long and ſhort ſyllables, but no diphthongs, except one.—Their accents not ſo violent as thoſe in Engliſh,—do not obſcure the pronunciation of the other ſyllables.—It is a language better for muſic than any other now known.—The words not loſt in their muſic.—It is more reconcilable to the rhythm of the language, than the muſic even of the Greek Tragedy.—The grammar of their language more compleat than that of the Engliſh, particularly in their verbs; but no declenſion of nouns.—This appears to be the

moſt artificial part of language,—one part of ſpeech, it has more than the Latin, viz. the Article,—has greater variety in its accents, and therefore in its poetry than the Engliſh.—Some obſervations upon language in general, ariſing from the Italian language.—The tone of different languages diſtinct from the pronunciation of the letters or words.—Very difficult to be acquired by a foreigner.

THE laſt modern language I ſhall mention is the Italian, a dialect of Latin, as well as the French and Spaniſh, but, like them, much corrupted by a mixture of barbarous words more than the modern Greek, and by the loſs of the grammatical art. The ſound of it is extremely vocal, much more than either Greek or Latin, and more than either of its two ſiſter languages, the French or Spaniſh. The words of it are long, and, being ſo vocal, ſound very ſweetly, indeed I think too ſweetly: For there is no aſpiration in the language, not even of vowels; and

none of the words terminate in conſonants, as I am informed, except their article in its different caſes, (for their article is not like the Engliſh, indeclinable: The caſes are, *il*, *del*, *al*, *dal.*) and except three prepoſitions, *in*, *con*, *per*. They have therefore this great advantage over the Latin in point of ſound, that not one of their words terminate with a mute conſonant, or with the liquid M, which, as I have obſerved, ſhuts the mouth as much or more than any of the mutes; nay, they do not terminate any of the words which are of the growth of their language, and not foreign words, with the hiſſing letter S. Sometimes indeed, when the vowel E ends the word, they elide it; and this not only in their verſe, but in their proſe. But they never do it, unleſs the preceding letter be ſome one of the liquids, not M however; with which, as I have ſaid, they never cloſe a word. Now, I think, this makes an agreeable variety in their ſtile, being not unlike many of the eliſions uſed in Greek. They have very few monoſyllables, much fewer than the French, and very much fewer than the Engliſh, which is crouded, as I have ob-

ſerved, with monoſyllables; a thing that muſt neceſſarily produce a ſtop more or leſs in the pronunciation, betwixt the different words. Neither the French language, therefore, nor the Engliſh, can have that flow in ſpeaking which the Italian has, nor be pronounced in the way that Milton mentions*, or, as Horace ſays, the Greek language was pronounced, *ore rotundo.*

But, however ſweet or flowing the ſound of their language may be, they have loſt what I call the muſic of language; I mean the antient accents, which the Latins, no doubt, had, as well as the Greeks, tho', perhaps, not ſo perfect. And they have adopted, from the northern nations which ſettled among them, and whoſe race, I am perſuaded, makes at preſent the greateſt part of the inhabitants of Italy, ſuch accents as we uſe; for that theſe accents were not uſed by the Greeks and Romans, I think is certain; not only from the ſilence

* See the paſſage from Milton, quoted on p. 108 of this Volume.

of all their grammarians, but from this conſideration, that if beſides their tones and their quantity, they had had ſuch accents as we have, the pronunciation of their language would have been too complex and embarraſſed, having both their own accents and ours, and together with theſe, their rhythm or quantity *. And beſides, I am perſauded, they would have very much hurt the muſic of their language by ſuch an addition. If there could be any doubt in this matter, it is, I think, entirely removed by the want of ſuch accents in the French language: For the Franks, tho' they loſt the muſical accents of the Latins, not being a muſical nation, I think it is impoſſible to believe, that if the Romans had ſpoke with ſuch accents as ours, they would have loſt theſe accents too, while they retained the words. By their accents, however, ſuch as they are, the Italians make their poetry as we do, and not only rhyming poetry, but blank verſe. And

* See further upon this ſubject, p. 32.—p. 39. and 40.

it is in this way that our poetry and the Italian have ſo great an advantage over the French, which can vary its verſe no otherwiſe, than by the number of ſyllables making it either ſhorter or longer, or by the rhyme. By theſe accents, the Italians have as great variety of verſe as we have, and I think greater; for they have not only Iambic, Trochaic, and Anapeſtic feet, as we have *, but alſo Spondees and Dactyles. I have only further to obſerve of their accents, that they are much leſs violent than the Engliſh accents, and therefore, when they are drawn back to the antepenult, which they ſometimes are in Italian, tho' not ſo frequently as in Engliſh, they do not obſcure the pronunciation of the other two ſyllables; which, as I have obſerved, is always the caſe more or leſs in Engliſh †. And for this and the other reaſons above mentioned the Italian language

* See upon the ſubject of Engliſh Verſe, Vol. II. Book iii. Cap. 8.

† P. 116. and 119.

is very much fitter for muſic than the Engliſh, or any other language in Europe, being ſo adapted to the muſic, that the words not only in their *recitative*, but in their *airs*, are diſtinctly heard: So that in their operas, if we underſtand the language, we enjoy the pleaſure both of muſic and poetry. And according to my information, if the opera be well compoſed, the muſic is ſo ſuited to the words, that there is no violence done either to the accent or quantity; for there never is a long note laid upon a ſhort or unaccented ſyllable. And in this reſpect the muſic of the Italian opera appears to be more perfect than the muſic of the Greek tragedy, at leaſt in later times; for there, as the Halicarnaſſian has obſerved, they often did violence to both the melody and rhythm of the language *.

With reſpect to quantity, the Italians have ſome long ſyllables, as well as we, tho' not ſo many of them, or ſo commen-

* Περὶ Συνθέσεως, cap. 11.

ſurate to the ſhort as to make poetry of them. But there is one kind of long ſyllables, and the higheſt ſounding of them all, which they want almoſt entirely; I mean the diphthongs: For they uſe only one double ſound, which they mark by the letters I U, and ſound them like the diphthong EU; as in the word *ſiume* for *ſiumen*, a *river*, and *ſiamma* for *ſiamma*, a *ſlame*.

As to the grammar of the language, they have all the tenſes, with the variety of three perſons and of two numbers, formed by flexion, except the praeter-perfect tenſe, which they form, as we and the French do, by auxiliary verbs. They have a diſtinction too of moods, as well as the French, which they obſerve very accurately: But as to the declenſion of nouns, their language is as imperfect as ours or the French, and I believe I may add every other modern language of Europe; for their caſes are all formed by prepoſitions or particles. And this perſuades me, that the declenſion of nouns is one of the greateſt artifices in language, which has come lateſt in the progreſs of language towards perfection,

and has been firſt loſt in the corruption of it. But the Italian has one great advantage over its mother language; for it has one part of ſpeech more, I mean the Article, which I have no doubt that the Italians have borrowed from the barbarous languages, as well as their accents; for all the barbarous languages of Europe, ſuch as the Celtic, the Gothic and all its different dialects, have an Article as well as the Greek.

I have dwelt thus long upon the Italian language, becauſe, I think, it furniſhes ſome obſervations of importance in the hiſtory of language: And, in the firſt place, it appears ſurpriſing that the Italian, tho' a language much leſs excellent upon the whole than the Latin, ſhould have the uſe of that part of ſpeech juſt now mentioned, which the Latin entirely wants; I mean the article. This, I have no doubt, they got from the Lombards, or other barbarians that ſettled in their country: For the Greek, at the time the Italian language took the form it now has, was entirely loſt in Italy; and, beſides, the Italian Article has not the

leaſt reſemblance to the Greek. Now, the queſtion is, how thoſe barbarous languages ſhould have got this important part of ſpeech, when the Latins had it not? That thoſe barbarians invented it, I cannot believe; for it does not appear to me, that they were capable of inventing ſo wonderful an art as language, or even of making ſuch an addition to it, which we ſee the Latins could not make. My conjecture therefore is that thoſe barbarous languages came later off the Greek (or rather off ſome common parent language) after it was completely formed, and had got all the parts of ſpeech, and, among others, the Article. But, tho' I think it is evident that the Italians did not take their Article from the Greeks, it is remarkable that they uſe it as the Greeks do, prefixing it not only to appellative, but to proper nouns; and with the very ſame ſignification, denoting either a perſon eminent and well known, or a perſon that had been mentioned before *.

* See what I have ſaid of this uſe of the article, v

Another obſervation is, that the Italian is of much ſofter and more pleaſant articulation, than its parent the Latin, tho' in other reſpects ſo much inferior. This appears the more extraordinary, that the barbarous languages with which it is mixed, and from which, as I have obſerved, it has got its accents, muſt be preſumed to have been of much harſher and rougher pronunciation than even the Latin. This I think can be accounted for no otherwiſe than from the natural genius of the Italians for muſic, and their having cultivated it much more than any other nation in Europe. Their Opera muſic, I am perſuaded, is derived from the theatrical muſic of the antient Greeks and Romans: And their *Recitative*, I believe, is no other than the manner in which the paſſionate parts of their tragedies or comedies, called in Latin *cantica*, and in Greek μονῳδίαι, were ſpoken: And the *Airs* in their O-

55. and following, of Vol. ii. of this work. See alſo of the ſame Volume, Book i. Chap. 7. where I ſpeak of the uſe of the article in French and in Engliſh.

pera, are imitations of the ſongs of the antient chorus. What makes this extremely probable is, that the opera firſt appeared in ſplendour in Venice, whither the people flocked in great numbers, to take ſhelter in its ſeas and moraſſes, when the reſt of Italy was over-run by barbarians, and carried with them what remained of the antient arts. To confirm this conjecture, we find another thing, and a very remarkable thing, belonging to the antient theatre, which was preſerved in Venice, and from thence was, like the opera, carried to other towns of Italy; I mean the uſe of maſks by the actors in comedy*. About the time that the antient theatrical muſic was revived in Italy, I ſuppoſe that the Italian language was formed, ſuch as we have it at preſent, and if ſo, it is no wonder that it is ſo ſoft in the pronunciation, and as much adapted to muſic, as I believe any language ever was.

* See what is ſaid upon this ſubject, by Dr Brown, in his Diſſertation upon poetry and muſic, p. 200. and following.

After having ſaid ſo much of the Italian language, I think it is proper to let the reader know, that I do not myſelf underſtand it; but that I take the account, I have given of it, from one who reſided above ten years in Italy, and who, beſides underſtanding the language perfectly, is more learned in the Italian arts of painting, ſculpture, muſic, and poetry, than any man I ever converſed with. His natural good taſte he has improved by the ſtudy of the monuments of antient art to be ſeen in Rome and Florence: And as beauty in all the arts is pretty much the ſame, conſiſting of grandeur and ſimplicity, variety, decorum, and a ſuitableneſs to the ſubject, I think he is a good judge of language and of writing, as well as of painting and ſculpture. How much Milton improved his genius by his travels in Italy, and by his ſtudy of the Italian arts, is well known: And Mr Thomſon the poet, did not, in my opinion, write well, till he went to Italy, and ſtudied there the monuments of antient art, and from them formed that taſte of noble ſimplicity, which is the perfection of all art. After this, he wrote his *Caſtle of Indolence*, the moſt per-

fect by far, in my judgment, of all his works, and the beſt allegorical and deſcriptive poem, I believe, in any language. The name of the artiſt I am ſpeaking of is *Brown*. He was bred a painter, but does not now lay on colours, judging that a mean part of the art compared with *drawing*, which undoubtedly is the moſt eſſential part of it, being that without which the colouring would ſignify nothing: And as he has formed his taſte in the art, by drawing the antient ſtatues, and *Bas Reliefs*, he tells me, what I am perſuaded is true, that nothing but the colours of Titian could add any beauty to good drawings of thoſe wonderful works of art. He therefore only draws, but better than any body I have ever known, as far as my judgment goes: And I know from gentlemen, who were at Rome while he was in it, that he was there reputed one of the beſt drawers in Italy. He practiſes at preſent in Edinburgh, with the approbation of all thoſe who are judges of the art; but he propoſes ſoon to go to London, where I hope he ſhall be received and encouraged as he deſerves.

Before I conclude this compariſon of languages, it is proper to obſerve, that, beſides the ſound of the words, and their different flexions and terminations, there is a particular tone belonging to each language, and which is different from the articulation, the accent, or the rhythm of the language. By this tone, a man of a good ear will diſtinguiſh a Frenchman from an Engliſhman, an Italian from either, and even an Engliſhman from a Scotchman, if he only hear the voice, tho' he do not underſtand a word of what they ſay.—This national tone, is the thing the moſt difficult to be acquired by any foreigner.

CHAP. XVII.

From the compariſon of languages in the preceeding chapters, it is evident that the Greek and Latin are much ſuperior to the modern.—Theſe are barbarous in the proper ſenſe of the word.—The author, in this inquiry, has followed the antient method of inveſtigating things.—The advantage to be got from the compariſon of different languages.—Impoſſible that a man, who underſtands only one language, can know either its excellencies or defects.—Not having the ſame materials as the antients, it is impoſſible we can compoſe ſo well.—All we can do, is to give as much variety as poſſible to our ſtile.—This is to be done chiefly by compoſition in periods.—Numbers in our proſe, not to be affected.—This the fault of ſome modern Engliſh writers.—Of the degeneracy of all languages, the originals of which we know.—The degeneracy moſt remarkable of

the Greek language.—The degeneracy of the Engliſh language in modern times, both in ſound *and* ſignification *of the words. —Example of this laſt.—Reaſon why the author has inſiſted ſo much upon the* ſound *of the languages he has compared.*—Written language not ſpoken, *may be called a* dead language, *whereas what* is ſpoken, *is* a living language.—*The degeneracy of language and other neceſſary arts of life, cannot be accounted for otherwiſe than by a degeneracy of the people.—The want of an ear and voice for muſic, makes the northern nations incapable of pronouncing as the antient Greeks did.—Of the great difficulty of the invention of language, both as to the* matter *and the* form.—*The* matter *of language not furniſhed, as that of other arts, by Nature, but by man himſelf.—Of the defect of the pronunciation even of vowels, in ſundry nations.—The* form *of language ſtill more difficult than the* material *part of it.—Wonderful inventions for expreſſing the infinity of things, by a limited number of words.—Language of ſo difficult invention, that it would not have been invent-

ed by men, without ſupernatural aſſiſtance; but, being invented, it might be cultivated and improved without ſuch aſſiſtance.—Even for this certain things neceſſary which are not to be found in this age.—The practice of language, after it is invented, different from the practice of other arts.

THUS I have compared two antient languages, and four modern, in point of beauty and excellency, and have ſhown, that it is not matter of taſte and fancy merely, but is evident from principles of the art, which cannot be diſputed, that the Greek and Latin are by many degrees ſuperior to any modern language, at leaſt that I know,--that, therefore, they are very juſtly named the *learned languages*;—and that theſe other are to be accounted unlearned, and even barbarous, tho' the national vanity of thoſe, who ſpeak ſuch languages, will, I know, be very much ſhocked with that appellation. But I hold the

want of art, and the defects and imperfections conſequent of that, to be the very definition of what we call barbarous in language, or in any thing elſe. In order to prove this, I have gone into a detail which may appear ſuperfluous to ſome of my readers, if they be of thoſe ſublime geniuſes of this age who deſpiſe the art the antients valued ſo much, by which they defined, divided, and diſtinguiſhed things, and who think they can at once, by the ſuperiority of their parts, comprehend the thing, without the trouble of minutely diſſecting and explaining it, as I have done language. But for men of my capacity, I find the antient method abſolutely neceſſary; and as ſome of my readers may be in the ſame ſituation, I have not grudged the trouble of uſing it, both for my own ſake, and for the ſake of thoſe who will deign to be ſo inſtructed.

To a man of curioſity, and who has ſo much of the philoſophical ſpirit as to deſire to underſtand thoroughly the nature of this wonderful art of language, the compariſon I have made of different languages,

antient and modern, with one another, in order to know in what they excell or are deficient, muſt be very agreeable and inſtructive. And indeed it appears to me impoſſible, that a man who knows but one language, the Engliſh ſuppoſe, and ſo can compare it with no other, ſhould be able to know either its defects or excellencies. He could not, for example, perceive how harſh and unmuſical its ſound is, compared with the antient languages, ſo much more muſical; nor could he find out that it was loaded with ſo many ſuperfluous as well as ill ſounding words, by having an analogy ſo much more imperfect than the Greek and Latin; and if he did not underſtand French, he could not diſcover the great advantage we have over that language by our accents, particularly in the article of verſification. In ſhort, by this compariſon, we are led to know, and to know ſcientifically, what is moſt perfect in the moſt uſeful as well as moſt wonderful art among men, an object, I think, of great curioſity to a philoſopher, if it were to be attended with no profit.

Another thing is evident, from what has been ſaid, that the antient Greeks and Romans, having ſo much better materials to work upon, muſt have compoſed very much better than we, not in ſpeaking only, but in writing. To vie with theſe, therefore, in beauty and elegance of ſtile, is ridiculous; and all we have for it, is to labour the ſenſe as much as poſſible, and to give to our compoſition as much variety as the genius of our language will permit. This, as I have obſerved, is to be done chiefly by compoſing in periods of different lengths, conſiſting of members alſo of different lengths, variouſly connected together, with a different ſtructure of the words, and a difference too in the matter, ſo as to furniſh a proper occaſion for a change of the tone of the voice, which is one of the greateſt beauties of ſpeaking. But this kind of compoſition is only proper for works of the rhetorical kind. In a plain didactic work, it would be improper to affect it; and even the hiſtorical period, as I have obſerved elſewhere, is different from the

oratorial *. But writing in the plaineſt manner, and upon the moſt common ſubjects, we may avoid a dull and tireſome uniformity. But above all, whatever be the ſubject upon which we write, we ſhould take care to avoid the affectation of giving numbers to our proſe, which was one of the greateſt beauties of antient compoſition, but of which our language, and I believe every other modern language, is abſolutely incapable, having neither melody nor rhythm. It is this affectation, which, as I have obſerved elſewhere, has made the ſtile of Lord Shafteſbury much worſe than it would have been otherwiſe †, but of which, after all, we may ſay, as an antient painter ſaid of a work of his own, —*It is more eaſy to find fault with it than to imitate it* ‡. As to ſome later writers, who, without the beauties and elegance of

* Vol. iii. of this work, p. 62.

† See Vol. iii. of this work, p. 284.

‡ Μιμησεται τις μαλλον, ἢ μιμησεται.

Lord Shafteſbury, have affected theſe numbers, their ſtile is to me altogether nauſeous.

There is another thing which, from what is ſaid, will occur to a reader who has comprehenſion of mind ſufficient to take in the hiſtory, not of a ſingle nation only, but of mankind;—that there is a wonderful degeneracy of this greateſt, and moſt uſeful art among men. For not only do we ſee this degeneracy from the antient Greek and Latin, in the modern Greek, the Italian, and the French; but in the Gothic languages there is the ſame falling off. For the Engliſh is not ſo good a language as the Saxon, nor the Saxon, or any other dialect of the Teutonick, ſo compleat a language as the original Gothic. And I am perſuaded the ſame will be found to be the caſe, where any language can be traced back to its original.

Of all the inſtances of this degeneracy, I think the modern Greek is the moſt remarkable; for the corruption of the other

languages I have mentioned, may be accounted for, from the mixture of the nations, who ſpoke them, with other nations. But the Greek nation has never been ſo mixed; and the preſent Greeks are the deſcendants of thoſe Greeks who ſpoke the fineſt language in the world, and excelled mankind in every other fine art. Their degeneracy, therefore, in the article of language, can only be aſcribed to ignorance and barbarity prevailing ſo much among them, as to make them loſe even their language; and they ſhould teach us and every other nation of Europe, that if we loſe the grammatical art, and the knowledge of what was moſt perfect in that art among the antient Greeks and Romans, our language will neceſſarily grow worſe, and become at laſt quite barbarous.

How much our ſtile is altered in point of compoſition ſince the days of Milton and Clarendon, and for the worſe, if the antient authors are to be our ſtandards, is evident. But, in much later times, ſince I was educated among Engliſh gentlemen at a foreign univerſity about fifty years ago,

I perceive a great alteration in the language, both as to the pronunciation and the ſenſe of the words. Of the pronunciation I have already ſpoken*; and I ſhall give but one example, among many that might be given, of an abuſe that has crept in, with reſpect to the ſignification of words; and I chooſe this example, the rather that it ſhews we can only preſerve the purity of our language by keeping to the antient ſtandard. The word I mean is *ingenuity*, which is now uſed, even by the beſt authors, to ſignify what is clever or acute in the operations of the mind; a ſenſe which has no connection with the ſignification of the Latin word, *ingenuitas*, from which it is derived. In Latin, the adjectives *ingenioſus* and *ingenuus*, ſignify things quite different; and the adjectives in Engliſh, which we derive from them, viz. *ingenious* and *ingenuous*, have the ſame difference of ſignification; and alſo the adverbs, which we derive from theſe adjectives, namely, *ingeniouſly* and *ingenuouſly*.

* Chap. xiii.

are alſo quite different in their ſignification. Why then ſhould we not make the ſame diſtinction in the ſubſtantives derived from theſe adjectives that we make in the adverbs, and ſay, *ingeniouſneſs*, from our adjective *ingenious*; and from the other adjective *ingenuous*, derive, according to rule, *ingenuity*, in Latin *ingenuitas*. And ſuch, I am perſuaded, will be found to be the uſe of the word by the authors of the laſt century. How much Milton and Doctor Middleton have adorned their ſtile by uſing Engliſh words derived from Latin in their true claſſical ſignification, I have elſewhere obſerved *.

In theſe obſervations upon language, many of my readers may perhaps think that I have inſiſted too much upon the ſound of it. But ſuch readers ſhould conſider, that language was made to be ſpoken; and that, for many ages of the world, no other uſe was made of it: And in ſeveral nations at this day, ſuch as the Indians of North America, where they hold

* Vol. iii. of this work, p. 27.—30.

councils, harangue, and deliberate, with great gravity and wiſdom upon public affairs, there is no uſe of letters. And even after the invention of letters, we know, that, among the Greeks and Romans, their national buſineſs was carried on chiefly by ſpeaking: And in every free country it muſt be ſo. Now, when that is the caſe, the ſound of language becomes a matter of importance; for the pleaſure of the ear contributes not a little to perſuaſion; and ſetting aſide that conſideration, language ſpoken may be ſaid to be *living language*, compared with *written language*, which may be called *the dead letter*, being altogether *inanimate*, and nothing more than marks or ſigns of language, wanting that chief beauty of elocution, which is given it by pronunciation and action. How ſtudious the Greeks were of the ſound of their language I have ſhown, in a diſſertation written upon that ſubject, annexed to the ſecond volume of this work.

From what has been ſaid in this book, an obſervation will occur to the philoſopher, that the hiſtory of language makes

not an inconſiderable part in the hiſtory of man: And there is not, perhaps, any thing belonging to a people, by which we can better judge of their genius and underſtanding. Such being the caſe, I would have thoſe conſider, who maintain that man has been always the ſame in all ages of the world, how they are to reconcile their ſyſtem with the univerſal degeneracy that we obſerve in the languages of all nations, whoſe antient language we know. Can that be accounted for otherwiſe, than by the people, who ſpeak the language, becoming barbarous and ignorant? It may be ſaid, that ſome of thoſe people, ſuch as the Greeks and Romans, have been over-run and conquered by barbarians; and ſo have become barbarous like them. But what ſhall we ſay of the Goths and Saxons, who never were conquered themſelves, but conquered other nations? Yet the Saxon is a much worſe language than its parent the Gothic *, nor is the Engliſh

* I had an intimate acquaintance, who was very learned in languages, and had made a particular ſtudy of the Gothic, of which there is only one book extant, viz. a tranſlation of the Four Goſpels, which is

near ſo perfect a language as the Saxon, from which it is immediately deſcended. And when we go to the other ſide of the Globe, I mean to India, we find there the ſame degeneracy of language. The Sanſcrit, which is the moſt ancient language of that country, all the other dialects of the Hindoo language being derived from it, is, I believe, the language of the greateſt art that ever exiſted: For with reſpect to the pronunciation, it has all the variety of tone, and of rhythm that the Greek has; and as to the gram-

preſerved in Upſal in Sweden, together with ſome fragments of the Epiſtle to the Romans. In all the Four Goſpels, he told me, he could not find one Greek or Latin word, or any word derived from either of theſe languages, tho' the tranſlators muſt have had many things to expreſs, for which there were not words in their language. But it would ſeem they made words for thoſe things, according to the rules of derivation or compoſition in their own language. In ſhort, he ſaid, it was a language which had all its roots within itſelf, as well as the Greek. He further ſaid, that it had an *article* of three genders, and he added, that it had likewiſe a dual number.——See what I have further ſaid of this language, p. 552.—555. of Vol. I. of this work, 2d edition.

mar of it, it has all the flexions that can well be imagined, having no leſs than ſeven declenſions, with a ſingular, dual, and plural number *. And in the other two great artifices of language, viz. compoſition and derivation, it appears to exceed all the languages we have ever heard of †. Now, the other dialects ſpoken in India, derived, as I have ſaid, from the Sanſcrit, are all corruptions of it more or leſs ‡. Such being the caſe, I aſk whence comes this degeneracy of the language of ſo many nations? And not only of their language, but of other arts that were practiſed by them, ſuch as building; for the edifices they erected, are not only grander, and more magnificent, but of

* See the tranſlation of the code of Gentoo's laws, by Mr Braſſey Halhed, with a preface, in which he gives this account of the Sanſcrit Language.

† See what I have ſaid of the compoſition and derivation of the Sanſcrit Language, p. 210.—492.—530. of Vol. II. and p. 56. of this Vol.

‡ See Mr Braſſey Halhed's Bengaleſe Grammar, and particularly p. 65.—127. and 137.

greater ſolidity and much more durable than our modern buildings. And there is another very uſeful art, which was much better practiſed by them than by us, I mean the writing art; for there are antient charters in Scotland, ſome of which I have ſeen, that are above five hundred years old and yet appear as freſh as if they had been written yeſterday. And the oldeſt record, I believe, in Europe, Doomſday book, which is now ſeven hundred years old, is in ſuch preſervation, that a copy of it has been lately made and printed. And I have ſeen ſome *fac ſimiles* of it, which ſhow it to be perfectly legible by thoſe who have ſtudied the hand. Whereas, our later writings, that are not above a hundred or a hundred and fifty years old, are hardly legible; and what we write at preſent, will not be legible in much leſs time. Now, is it poſſible, that there can be ſuch a corruption of arts among a people, and ſome of them the moſt neceſſary for human life, without a degeneracy of the people? for I think it cannot be diſputed, that the excellency of all the works of art muſt de-

pend upon the genius, the underſtanding, the application, and the induſtry of thoſe who practiſe them.

There is one bodily faculty, which is found very defective among the northern nations, and which, if we were equal to the Greeks and Romans in every other reſpect, would render us unable to pronounce their language as they did, I mean the want of an ear and voice for muſic. The northern nations do not appear at any time to have been ſo muſical a people as the antient Greeks and even Romans. But at preſent among us there are many who have no ear or voice at all for muſic, a thing which, I am told, is hardly known in Italy, and I believe far leſs among the Greeks, even degenerate as they are at preſent. Now ſuch men, tho' they might articulate the antient Greek, could not give it the proper tones and rhythms which made that language truly muſical, and diſtinguiſhes it from all the modern languages of Europe. It is a thing ſo remote from our practice of ſpeaking, that we can hardly, as I have obſer-

ved, form an idea of it. And tho' we have muſic with words in our ſongs, it is a muſic of a very different kind from the muſic of ſpeech among the Greeks, as I have elſewhere ſhown *. What ſhould make us aſhamed of our incapacity in this reſpect is, that there is a brute animal among us, who comes nearer to the Greek pronunciation than any thing I know; I mean the Cuckow, who articulates his name moſt diſtinctly, and, at the ſame time, pronounces it to muſic, raiſing the tone of the firſt ſyllable, not ſo high as the acute accent among the Greeks, that is a *fifth*, but only a *third*, above the laſt.

The laſt obſervation, with which I ſhall conclude this book, is alſo of the philoſophical kind, ariſing naturally from the obſervations I have made upon the ſeveral languages that I have examined and compared, and it is this, that, of all the arts which have been invented by men, language is not only the moſt uſeful, being that, without which civil ſociety never could have been

* P. 37. and 38.

eſtabliſhed, but the art of moſt difficult invention, (if it be the invention of man,) and, after it is invented, of moſt difficult practice. To be convinced of this, let us conſider, firſt, the materials of which language is compoſed. Theſe are articulate ſounds, which we cannot form by inſtinct or our natural powers, as ſome of the brutes do, ſuch as the Cuckow above mentioned, and another bird they call the *Kockatoo*, ſo called likewiſe from this articulate ſound which he utters, but we muſt learn it from teaching, as we ſee deaf men learn it, or from imitation. Nature, therefore, has not furniſhed us the materials of this art, as ſhe has done of other arts; but we muſt furniſh, from our own ſtock, both the *matter* and the *form* of language. How difficult this is, appears from the example of deaf men juſt now mentioned, who are taught to articulate with labour and pains hardly to be credited, except by thoſe who have ſeen it; and from the example of nations far advanced in other arts of life, but who are very defective in articulation, not to ſpeak of the

grammatical part, which, as articulation is ſo familiar to us, we are apt to conſider as the only art of language. The Chineſe, who are by many thought to be a moſt ingenious people and do certainly practice ſome arts very well, have not yet learned to pronounce even all the vowels, which are by far of eaſier pronunciation than the conſonants, requiring nothing more than a certain form and configuration of the organs of the mouth. Yet the Chineſe cannot pronounce even the firſt of them, at leaſt not as we do; and another of them, viz. the *O* they cannot pronounce at all. Nor can the Siameſe pronounce the *U* *. And what is more wonderful ſtill, the Engliſh, far avdanced as they are in arts and civility, cannot pronounce, any more than the Siameſe, this vowel *U*, but make a diphthong of it, and pronouuce it *EU*; not diſtinguiſhing, as the French do, theſe two ſounds, the one ſimple, and the other

* Theſe facts I take from Bullet's Memoirs of the Celtic Language, Vol. i. Chap. 4. who, I ſuppoſe, muſt mean, that thoſe nations do not pronounce the letter he mentions as his countrymen the French do.

compounded †. As to the conſonants, there is more difficulty in the pronunciation of them; for it requires not only a certain configuration of the mouth, but each of them a different action of the organs of the mouth, and which is taught to the deaf men with much more difficulty than the ſimple configuration of thoſe organs, as I have been informed by Mr Braidwood, the famous teacher of the dumb to ſpeak, who now practiſes his art in London, but formerly in Edinburgh; where, having occaſion to ſee him frequently, and to converſe a good deal with him, I adviſed him to begin with teaching his ſcholars the pronunciation of the vowels, inſtead of teaching them the letters, as they ſtand in the order of the alphabet; and which he told me, he did with great ſucceſs.—It is not therefore to be wondered, that there are ſeveral of the conſonants which

† That the French pronounce this vowel *U* rightly and as the Greeks pronounced it, is evident from the mechanical account that Dionyſius the Halicarnaſſian gives of its pronunciation in his moſt valuable work περὶ Συνθέσεως, cap. 14.

whole nations do not pronounce *. Even the labial conſonants, ſuch as B, P, M, which appear to us to be of ſuch eaſy pronunciation, being among the firſt that our children learn, the nation of the Hurons cannot articulate; and the Baron Hontan tells us, that he ſpent four days to no purpoſe, in endeavouring to teach a Huron to pronounce them: The reaſon of which is, that there is one organ of pronunciation, which the Huron does not uſe at all, namely, the lips; for he always ſpeaks with open mouth †. Even a Frenchman cannot

* See in Vol. I. of this work, Book iii. Chap. 7. examples of many barbarous nations, who cannot pronounce different conſonants, particularly the Peruvians, who cannot pronounce the conſonants S, B, D, F, G, H. Ibid. p. 505.

† See Vol. I. of this work, p. 502. See alſo p. 479. The whole chapter is well worth reading by any man, who is curious about the origin of this wonderful art, which is beſt diſcovered by the ſtudy of ſuch a rude and imperfect a language as the Huron, very near, as I imagine, to the origin of the art, for it conſiſts of cries, ſuch as the brute animals utter with open mouth, and is only articulated by a few gutteral conſonants, ſuch as K, Q, and X, with the aſpirated H.

pronounce the aſpirated *T*, or *Th*; for he cannot ſay *Thee*; nor can an Engliſhman pronounce the aſpirated *K*, or *Ch*, for he ſays *Akilles*, not *Achilles*.

As to melody and rhythm, they are not eſſential to language; neither do I think the invention of them near ſo difficult as of articulation; for I am perſuaded, that language began in the ſouthern countries, where all the inhabitants were naturally muſical, as much as certain birds among us. It was therefore natural, and indeed in ſome ſort neceſſary, that the men, who firſt articulated, ſhould join with it both muſical tones and rhythms. But when from thoſe people the language was propagated to the barbarous and unmuſical northern nations, the muſical part of it would ſoon be loſt: But it continued among the nations of the ſouth, particularly the Greeks, where it was formed into an art, as regular as their vocal and inſtrumental muſic.

The *form* of language, as it is more ex-

cellent than the *matter**, ſo it is much more difficult: And indeed the contrivance, to expreſs the infinite variety of things by a number of words, not ſo great but that they may be retained by the memory and readily uſed, is to a philoſopher by far the moſt wonderful of all the inventions of men; tho', to a vulgar man, not learned in the ſcience of language, it appears not at all ſurpriſing. That the number of things, even of genuſes and ſpecieſes, is infinite, at leaſt with reſpect to our capacities, cannot be denied: And yet, if a language be in any degree compleat, all that infinity of things muſt be expreſſed accurately and diſtinctly by words, very much limited in number compared with the things expreſſed by them. Now, by what wonderful art is this to be done, not by one means as we have ſeen, but by four, *derivation*, *compoſition*, *flexion*, and laſtly, *the uſe of words in a figurative ſenſe*. Of all theſe I have ſpoken, both in this volume and

* Of this great diviſion of language into *matter* and *form*, which I have made the foundation of the ſcience of language, delivered by me in the 2d volume of this work, ſee p. 53. of that volume.

the ſecond volume of this work. But ſuppoſe words invented to expreſs all the conceptions of the human mind, diſtinguiſhing accurately each thing from another, the *ſubſtance*, for example, from the *accident*, the *action* from the *agent*, or the ſubject of the action; and all the different circumſtances of the action, from the action itſelf; there remains ſtill as great a difficulty, perhaps greater than any yet mentioned, how to join together ſo many words in a ſentence, ſo as to mark their connection one with another, without which, there could be no ſenſe or meaning in the ſentence. This is done, as we have ſeen, in the learned languages, chiefly by the means of *flexion*, which I hold to be the greateſt artifice of language, as it ſerves a double purpoſe, both to ſave the multiplication of words, and to ſhow their relation and connection with one another*. And thus it appears, that whether we conſider the *matter* of language, furniſhed

* See what I have ſaid of the nature of ſyntax, and the different ways by which words can be connected together, Vol. II. Book iii. Chap. 1.

not by God and nature, but by man himſelf, the *mechaniſm* of it, and the *form*, that is, the words conſidered not as ſounds merely, but as ſignificant, it muſt appear to be, as I have ſaid, the moſt wonderful of all human arts *.

And here a queſtion will naturally occur to every intelligent reader, whether the invention of ſuch an art does not exceed the faculties of man. And tho' I have no doubt that men, after the art is invented, may cultivate and improve it, and make of it as perfect a language as I have ſhown the Greek to be, I can hardly believe but that, in the firſt diſcovery of this ſo artificial a method of communication, men had ſupernatural aſſiſtance; and, therefore, I am much inclined to liſten to what the Egyptians tell us, of a God, as they call him, that is, an intelligence ſuperior to

* If the reader, after all that I have ſaid here, ſhould doubt of the extreme difficulty of this moſt wonderful art, I muſt refer him to what I have ſaid in Chapters 7. 8. and 9. Book iii. Vol. I. of this work, II. edition.

man, having firſt taught them the uſe of language: For that the art of language was firſt practiſed in Egypt, and from thence propagated all over the world, I have endeavoured to prove in the firſt volume of this work; and, the more I conſider the thing, the more I am confirmed in that opinion, for which I will give many additional reaſons in the fourth volume of my Metaphyſics, if I ſhall live to publiſh it. Here I will only ſay further, that if we believe that Providence has ever at any time interpoſed in the affairs of men, and aſſiſted them in their recovery from their fallen ſtate* by enabling them to invent arts and form ſocieties, which only could make them intellectual creatures, it muſt, I think, have been in the invention of this art, without which there could have been no civil ſociety, nor art or ſcience among men.

* In this 4th Volume of Mataphyſics I propoſe to ſhow, that the fall of Man is a truth of philoſophy as well as of religion; and that he was aſſiſted to recover his former ſtate, ſo far at leaſt as to become an intellectual creature, by extraordinary interpoſitions of Providence not only in Judea, but in other countries.

As Providence does every thing that is neceſſary for accompliſhing its great purpoſes, ſo it does nothing more: And, therefore, after language was diſcovered and once ſet a-going, it was left to the natural faculties of men to cultivate and improve it. But this muſt have been the work of ages, and could not have been performed but in a nation that appears to have laſted ſo long as that of Egypt, and where there was a claſs of men ſet apart for religion and the ſtudy of arts and ſciences*. Nor do I think, that even in ſuch a country it could have been brought to any great degree of perfection, if men had lived as ſhort time as they do now, and died before age and experience had matured their judgment, after living a few years with crazy and infirm bodies. In theſe later times, tho' we may add ſomething to former diſcoveries, (for according to the common ſaying, *facile eſt inventis addere*), I think it is hardly poſſible, that we could invent an art of any great conſequence, much leſs an art

* See Vol. II. Book iii. Chap. 13.—See alſo Vol. I. p. 566. of the ſecond edition.

ſo extremely difficult as that of language. All therefore we ſhould aim at is, to preſerve the arts that have been handed down to us from our forefathers, or to reſtore them when loſt; and I think, it is one of the greateſt eulogiums that Horace beſtows upon Auguſtus, when he ſays that, *veteres revocavit artes.*

I will conclude with obſerving a very ſingular thing concerning this wonderful art, and which ſhows, more than any thing elſe that I know, the power of that faculty of imitation, which diſtinguiſhes our ſpecies ſo much from every other. And it is this, that other arts we cannot practice without being artiſts, that is, without having learned the principles and rules of the art: Whereas, we ſee women, and even children, ſpeak a language very well, nay, write it well, without knowing one rule of grammar, or underſtanding any thing of the art or ſcience of language. It is indeed true, that muſic is practiſed, in the ſame way as language, by mere imitation; but I am perſuaded, that in muſic we are more aſſiſted by our natural

inſtinct; and I have little doubt, but that men *ſung* before they *ſpoke*: For we have from nature thoſe tones of which muſic is compoſed; whereas, even the matter of language, I mean articulate ſounds, are not given by nature to us, as they are to ſome brutes, but are a work of art, and as I have ſhown, of the greateſt art.

BOOK II.

Of Stile, and its different Kinds.

CHAP. I.

Public ſpeaking *an art—alſo* private converſation.—Writing *an art likewiſe.—The beſt orations could not pleaſe, if they were not firſt well written.—The art of writing different, according to the different ſubjects —In writing upon certain ſciences, ſuch as mathematics, no art of ſtile is required.—Of the nature of that ſtudy, and how much it engroſſes a man.*

IN the preceeding book I have examined and compared the materials for ſtile, which different languages afford. In this book I intend to treat of ſtile itſelf, by way of ſupplement to what I have written upon the ſubject in the preceeding volume of this work.

Altho' language, as I have obſerved, however difficult the invention of it may have been, is, by means of that wonderful faculty of imitation belonging to human nature, ſo eaſy in the practice, that men ſpeak it and even write it without any art at all, yet we are not for that to imagine, that there is no art of ſpeaking. That there is an art of public ſpeaking, I think impoſſible to doubt, tho' many men ſpeak even in public, as if they thought it could be performed without any ſtudy or art. But even in private ſpeaking, if it be of the elegant and polite kind, there is an art, and an art not commonly underſtood, as I ſhall ſhow, when I come to treat of the ſtile of converſation.

Speaking, is no doubt, an art more difficult than writing, requiring, beſides the words and their compoſition, a proper elocution; for which purpoſe certain bodily qualities are neceſſary, ſuch as an agreeable countenance, and a good voice both clear and ſweet, with a diſtinct articulation *. But writing is likewiſe an art, and a very great art too; nor would the orations of Demoſthenes have pleaſed us near ſo much as they do, if they had not been written and compoſed with as much art as they were pronounced. Yet there are many who think, there is no art of writing, any more than of ſpeaking: And hence it is, that *Scribimus indocti doctique*, as Horace has obſerved of the men of his age. But thoſe, who have ſtudied writing, know not only that there is an art of ſtile and ſpeaking, but that it is different, according to the different ſubjects of which

* See upon this ſubject, what Cicero ſays, in his dialogue *De Oratore*, where he ſays, that ſome people are by nature ſo deficient in voice and articulation, in countenance too and movement, that tho' they excel ever ſo much in genius and art, yet they never could be orators, Lib. I. Chap. 25.

it treats; and that there is a poetical ſtile, a dialogue ſtile, an oratorial, an hiſtorical, and a didactic.

As to the laſt ſtile, it may be obſerved, that there is one kind of it, which requires no art at all, and where it would be ridiculous to affect any thing like art or ornament in words or compoſition. What I mean, is the language of mathematics, the ſubject of which are lines and figures, numbers, calculation, and menſuration. And it is well for the mathematicians, that their ſcience requires nothing that deſerves the name of ſtile; for there are few of them that are ſcholars, and fewer ſtill that are men of taſte: And according to my obſervation, there is no ſtudy or application, which engroſſes a man ſo entirely as mathematics, rendering him ſometimes unfit not only for the buſineſs, but even the ordinary commerce of life; and indeed I have known methematicians, that I thought had hardly the common feelings of humanity. Upon ſuch men as theſe Dr Swift has, in the voyage to Laputa, beſtowed a great deal of ridicule, repreſenting them as living in

ſome ſort out of the world. This may be thought by many to be very much exaggerated, but we are to conſider, that, when the Doctor wrote, mathematics were much more in faſhion than they are now; for they had come in place of the antient philoſophy, which was then generally cried down all over Europe, and particularly in England, where the *philoſophy* of Sir Iſaac Newton, as it is called, was put in place of it *. There are, however, exceptions to this rule; and I know one man particularly, whoſe mind is ſo enlarged, that, tho' he be one of the greateſt mathematicians of this age, and particularly learned in Sir Iſaac Newton's aſtronomy, he is at the ſame time a ſcholar and a philoſopher, and withal an agreeable companion. By this deſcription, every man who

* It was about this time, that Lord Shaftesbury, in his *Advice to an Author*, part iii. ſect. 1. ſays, 'That a 'man, who dedicated himſelf [illegible] 'and *circles*, came off well, if by good fortune he kept 'his head ſound.'

knows Dr Horſley, will know that I mean him *.

In a ſtile not unlike the mathematical are written Ariſtotle's *eſoteric* books, or

* By what I have ſaid here, I hope it will not be underſtood that I mean to diſcourage the ſtudy of mathematics; on the contrary, I maintain, that geometry and arithmetic (by which I mean the ſcience of numbers, not the practice merely), ought to be the firſt ſciences a young man learns: And accordingly they were firſt taught, as I have elſewhere obſerved, in the ſchool of Pythagoras, which produced the greateſt men in arms and government, as well as ſcience and philoſophy, that ever exiſted—(See what I have ſaid upon this ſubject, in the preface to the third Volume of Antient Matephyſics, p. 7. 23. and following). But this I maintain, that, tho' arithmetic and geometry be the beſt preparation for philoſophy, yet if a man addict himſelf wholly to theſe ſtudies, he will not only be unfit for the buſineſs of the world, but even for good company: For he will want that taſte and ſenſe of what is becoming in conduct and behaviour, which is eſſential to the character of a gentleman, and an agreeable companion. And indeed I obſerve, that ſuch men loſe almoſt the idea of mind, to which only beauty and grace belong. Thoſe of them who are ſo vain of excelling in the ſcience of lines and figures, (for arithmetic among us can hardly be called a ſcience), ought to conſider, that it is only what may be called the elements of ſcience, being the firſt effort of the human mind to abſtract itſelf

books of abſtruſe philoſophy. But in his writings upon popular ſubjects, ſuch as morals, poetry, and rhetoric, in which he treats of the actions, character, and ſentiments of men, his ſtile is very different: For it is as much ornamented as any didactic ſtile ſhould be; and there is compoſition in periods in it, particularly there is one period, with which he begins his *po-*

from matter, in which we are aſſiſted by viſible ſigns. And as the ideas are ſo ſimple and ſo determinate, and the concluſions deduced from propoſitions ſelf-evident, it is not, one ſhould think, any matter of great glory to excell in it. But, where *mind* is the ſubject, and not *body* or its dimenſions, and where the ideas are ſo much more complex, and cannot be typified by any thing falling under the ſenſes;—there to excell, is indeed worthy of praiſe.—And ſuch is the nature of logic, morals and metaphyſics. To be vain therefore of excelling in geometry or arithmetic, is as ridiculous, as if a ſcholar ſhould be vain of having learned his alphabet: For theſe ſciences are truly no more than the A, B, C, of ſcience. They are however, as I have ſaid, an excellent preparation for philoſophy, and very proper to give a young mind a taſte of demonſtration and accurate ſcience. But whoever miſtakes them for philoſophy, does not know what philoſophy is: For philoſophy is the ſcience of cauſes, being the ſcience of mind, which is the cauſe of every thing.

etics, as well compoſed as any in Demoſthenes *.

Now, neither geometry nor arithmetic will apply to the inveſtigation of the cauſes and principles of things; and as often as they have been attempted to be employed in that way, ſo often the attempt has failed.

* See what I have further ſaid of Ariſtotle's ſtile, Vol. III. of this work, Book IV. Chap. xix. p. 358.

CHAP. II.

Writing, being an art, muſt be either invented or learned.—Was not invented among the northern nations, any more than any other liberal art.—Muſt be learned from the Greeks, as well as ſtatuary and painting.—Good writing more difficult than either of theſe arts.—The compariſon of them with the writing art, both as to the ſubject and the materials.—The beſt models of the writing art ſtill extant.

HAVING ſhewn in the preceding chapter that ſtile in writing, as well as in ſpeaking, is an art, it follows of neceſſary conſequence, that every man who writes muſt either have invented the art or learned it. As to invention, I have a great doubt whether we of the northern regions, not favoured ſo much by the muſes

and graces as thoſe of the ſouthern, have the capacity, or ever had, of inventing any liberal art; but be that as it will, the fact is certain, that we have invented none. Some mechanical arts, indeed, we have invented, ſuch as printing; and of ſome accidental diſcoveries of powers of Nature, ſuch as that of gun-powder, we have made an art, but which we never ſhould have done, had we been as wiſe as the Indians who diſcovered it long before us, but forbade the uſe of it*. But as to the liberal arts, we have contented ourſelves with imitating thoſe that have come down to us from the Greeks and Romans.

It appears, therefore, that we muſt learn the writing art. Now we learn either by teaching or imitation, or both ways, which laſt is no doubt the moſt perfect way of learning every thing. But if we are to learn to write by only one of theſe two ways, I hold that ſtile, as well as language, is better learned by imitation than by teaching.

* See the preface to the Code of the Gentoo laws, publiſhed by Braſſey Halhed.

The queſtion then is, who are to be our maſters, and whom we are to imitate? And I ſay it is the antient Greeks and Romans, from whom we muſt learn the writing art, as well as every other ingenious and liberal art. But of the two, it will be aſked, who ſhould be our principal maſters? and I ſay it ſhould be the Greeks, not the Romans, who were themſelves taught by the Greeks *, a people who appear to me to have been deſtined by God and Nature to excell all others in genius and the fine arts, as much as the Egyptians in ſcience and philoſophy: For, as I have obſerved elſewhere †, there is a difference of character in nations as well as individuals; nor has nature profuſely beſtowed all her gifts upon any one nation, any more than upon any one individual.

There are I know among us free ſpirits, as they call themſelves, who ſcorn this fla-

* See what I have ſaid upon the ſubject of the imitation of the Greek writers, Vol. III. Book iv. Chap. 20.

† In the Preface to Volume iii. of Metaphyſics, p. 6.

viſh ſubjection to the antients, and inſiſt to uſe their natural liberty, and be themſelves their own maſters in ſtile and compoſition. At the ſame time they confeſs, that in other arts, ſuch as ſtatuary and painting, we muſt ſubmit to be taught by the antients; and without ſtudying the antient monuments which the Greeks have left us of their ſculpture, we cannot excell in either of the two above mentioned arts. But, ſay they, the writing art is not ſo difficult as either of theſe. Now I ſay, that in this they are miſtaken, and that good writing is more difficult than any other of the fine arts, oratory alone excepted, which, beſides ſtile and compoſition, includes pronunciation, an art of itſelf very difficult. But I ſhall confine what I have to ſay upon the ſubject of this compariſon to ſtatuary and painting.

That poetry, or writing in verſe, is a greater art than painting or ſculpture, no man, who has ſtudied in Ariſtotle's poetics the ſcience and philoſophy of the fine arts, can have any doubt. But I ſhall here only ſpeak of what is, no doubt, an art inferior to poetry, writing in proſe. That it is

preferable to landſcape painting, or the repreſentation of the animal life either in ſculpture or painting, is evident to every body who knows that the beauty of thoſe arts conſiſts chiefly in the value of the ſubjects they imitate, not merely in the imitation, which, however perfect, is but little valued by the real connoiſſeur. It is therefore only the painting or ſculpture of human actions that can be compared with writing; and I ſhall compare them firſt with reſpect to the ſubject, and then with reſpect to the materials with which they work.

The ſubject of the painter and ſculptor's art is the characters, ſentiments, and actions of men. The ſame is the ſubject of the writer, if he write of human things, with this difference, that the writer exhibits them in ſucceſſion, and ſo gives you the progreſs of them, which, if well executed, both moves and inſtructs us more than any ſingle ſcene of them, which is all that painting or ſculpture can repreſent; for theſe arts are confined to an inſtant of

time, and to one place. It is true, that Hogarth has enlarged the bounds of his art, by giving us ſucceſſive ſcenes, and making a hiſtory and kind of drama of ſome of his pieces, ſuch as the rake and harlot's progreſs; and in this, I think, he has ſhown a genius ſuperior to any painter of the age. But no body will compare his pieces, however excellent of the kind, to the hiſtories of Herodotus or Livy. And indeed, it is of neceſſity, that the works of writing ſhould be much grander and more comprehenſive, than thoſe of painting or ſculpture; and I muſt confeſs, that even a ſingle ſcene of ſentiment or paſſion well written, affects me more than any repreſentation of it in painting or ſculpture that I ever ſaw. But beſides paſſions, ſentiments, and actions, by writing are expreſſed the operations of our prime faculty, intellect, in reaſoning, which cannot be repreſented by ſculpture or painting. Such are works of philoſophy: Such are ſpeeches in hiſtory: Such are the orations of Demoſthenes; which, if they had not been written, muſt have been loſt to us.

The ſubject therefore of writing is much more extenſive, and more noble too, than the ſubject of the other two arts: And as to the materials with which they work; thoſe, employed by ſculpture, are ſtone or metal; thoſe by painting, colours and canvas; and thoſe by the writing art, words. Now, words are of more ready uſe, more abundant, of greater variety, and therefore better adapted to expreſs the infinite variety of things, which are the ſubject of the writing art, than the materials of the other two arts.

Thus, I think, I have proved that writing, even in proſe, is a nobler as well as more difficult art than painting or ſculpture; and, therefore, if we muſt have recourſe to antient models for theſe arts, much more is it neceſſary that we ſhould form our taſte in the writing art by the imitation of the beſt authors Greek or Latin, and particularly the Greek authors: And we have this encouragement to do ſo, as I have obſerved elſewhere *, that we are ſure the very beſt models of the writing

* See Vol. III. p. 378. et ſeq.

art have come down to us; whereas we are by no means ſure that the beſt ſtatues of antient Greece are preſerved to us *.—Upon this ſubject of the imitation of the antients I will ſay a good deal more in the ſequel of this work; I ſhall only add at preſent, that I believe no example can be given of any modern having ſucceeded in writing either proſe or verſe, who did not form his taſte upon the beſt antient models.

* Winkleman has a doubt, whether any one ſtatue of the beſt days of Greece is now extant.—Certain it is, that many of them, which were in Conſtantinople in the twelfth century, are now not to be found.

CHAP. III.

Variety *the great beauty of ſtile, as well as of language.—Of the variety of ſingle words.—There may be too great variety of theſe.—Examples of authors who exceed in that way, ſuch as Plato, Cicero, and Lord Shaſteſbury.—Demoſthenes a model in that reſpect, as well as in others; —alſo Horace.—The rule to be followed in this matter.*

WRITING having been ſhewn to be an art, in the preceding chapter, what is the chief beauty, as I have elſewhere obſerved, in language, and indeed in every thing of art, being that, without which there can be no other beauty, the ſame is neceſſary in ſtile; I mean *variety* *. For in the

* See the paſſages upon this ſubject, that I have

two things of which ſtile conſiſts, the words and the compoſition, if there was not a certain variety, tho' the words were ever ſo well choſen, and put together in the beſt manner poſſible, yet the ſtile would be tedious and diſguſting.

I will begin with ſingle words —The abundance and variety of them is what makes what we call a *copious* ſtile, which, no doubt, pleaſes very much; but, as in other things, ſo in it there may be an exceſs as well as a defect; for if the language be too much varied by tropes, or by uſing too many different words to expreſs the ſame thing, every judicious reader or hearer will be offended. This fault is very conſpicuous in many of our modern writings, and indeed is to be found more or leſs in almoſt all our late productions. My Lord Shafteſ-

quoted from Quintilian and the Halicarnaſſian, Vol. III. p 152.—Here the reader may obſerve, that the two beauties of variety of language and variety of ſtile, muſt in ſome degree go together; for it is only in a language that admits of ſuch variety of arrangement of the words as the Greek and Latin do, that there can be any great variety of ſtile.

bury, as I have elſewhere obſerved, is, in my judgment, the moſt copious as well as elegant writer we have in proſe: But he commonly exceeds very much in this particular, and may be ſaid to play very often and wanton with the language; as particularly in his *Advice to an author*, how many changes has he rung upon *ſoliloquy* or *ſelf-converſe*, indeed more than I ſhould have thought the language could have furniſhed. Among the antients, Plato has ſomething of this fault, but Cicero much more, eſpecially in his orations; and indeed he ſeems every where to labour to convince the reader of the juſtice of his obſervation, but of which however he has not convinced me, that the Latin language is more rich in words than the Greek *.

* *O inopem Graeciam*, ſpeaking of the Greek language, is an exclamation of his ſomewhere: For, as I have obſerved, he deals much in that figure.—At the ſame time, I do not deny that the Latin language is a rich language, eſpecially as Cicero has uſed it; but that it is a richer language than the Greek, I cannot believe. And in other paſſages Cicero himſelf acknowledges the poverty of his language; as where he tells us, that the words *Phyſica* and *Dialectica*

In this, as well as every thing elſe belonging to ſtile, Demoſthenes excels. For he is copious in words, but not ſuper-abun-

were borrowed from the Greek. Even the name of *Philoſophy* was taken from that language; and what is more extraordinary, the Romans had no name for his own art, till they naturalized the word *Rhetorica*. (See *Academic*. lib. i. cap. 7.) And in his philoſophical works, he very often uſes Greek terms for want of Latin: And Lucretius, tho' he does not uſe the ſame freedom, complains of the poverty of the language;

> Nec me animus fallit, Graiorum obſcura reperta
> Difficile illuſtrare Latinis verſibus eſſe:
> Multa novis verbis praeſertim cum ſit agendum,
> Propter aegeſtatem linguae et rerum novitatem.
>
> Lib. i. in Prooemio.

Neither can I believe, that the Romans in genius exceeded all other nations; which, however, Cicero affirms, without even excepting the Greeks. (Lib. i. *De Oratore*, Cap. 4.) Nor can I approve of his treating the Greeks in the manner he does, calling them *Graeculi* (Ibid. cap. 11.) and *Otioſi et loquaces*, and only *fortaſſe docti et eruditi* (Ibid. cap. 22.) For tho' it be true, that they had then a great deal of leiſure, not being employed, as they were formerly, in arms and government, they were for that very reaſon much more learned, not only in philoſophy, but in every art, and among others in the art of ſpeaking;

dant. And here again, I cannot help differing from Cicero, who ſays, that even Demoſthenes did not fill his ears: For I ſay, his ears were vitiated by the practice of the ſchools of declamation, where, in order to draw the applauſe of boys or any ignorant crowd, the ſame things were ſaid over and over again, with much exaggeration and amplification. But Demoſthenes had formed his taſte upon the practice of real buſineſs, not upon

which, as Cicero himſelf tells us, his countrymen learned chiefly from the Greeks: And the fact moſt certainly is, that the Romans got all their learning from the Greeks, and had nothing they could call their own, except the ſcience of government and arms, as their own poet Virgil has confeſſed, who in oratory particularly, as well as in other arts, has given the preference to the Greeks in theſe famous lines.

Excudent alii ſpirantia mollius aera;
(Credo equidem); vivos ducent de marmore voltus;
Orabunt cauſas melius; coelique meatus
Deſcribent radio, et ſurgentia ſidera dicent:
Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento;
(Hae tibi erunt artes); paciſque imponere morem;
Parcere ſubjectis, et debellare ſuperbos.

Æneid, Lib. 6. v. 847.

the mimicry of it in fictitious cauſes. The author in Latin, who of all others has varied his expreſſion the moſt agreeably, is in my opinion Horace, who is rich and copious in words and phraſes, particularly in his odes, but without affectation or vain ſhew. And tho' it be evident to every man who knows what fine writing is, that ſuch a variety of choice words and phraſes muſt have coſt him a great deal of pains, yet they appear ſo eaſy and natural, that he well deſerves the eulogium, Petronius beſtows upon him, of *Curioſa feliciſtas*. The Rule in this matter ſeems to be, that the change ought not to be too frequent, ſo as to appear to be merely for the ſake of variety; and when it is made, the new word, ſhould, if poſſible, expreſs the thing more fully and accurately, or with more force and emphaſis.

CHAP. IV.

Of the compoſition of words.—Of the variety, which the rhythms *and* accents *of the Greek language gave to their pronunciation.—Thoſe were a beauty of their proſe, as well as of their verſe compoſition.—No* melody *or* rhythm *in the pronunciation of Engliſh.—We have only what we call* accents.—*Theſe meaſure our verſe but not our proſe.—The French have neither* quantity *nor* accent.—*The Italians have* accents.--*The modern Greeks have* accents *ſuch as ours.—We want one of the greateſt beauties of antient compoſition, variety of arrangement of words.—Not eaſy to ſet bounds to that variety in the antient languages.—That arrangement not ſo artificial in their converſation, and in their laws and decrees;—very artificial in their poetry.—Examples of this from Horace's odes.—Not ſo much of it in*

his ſatires and epiſtles.—Virgil's verſification diſtinguiſhed in this way;—too much of it in him;—leſs of it in Homer, except in his ſimilies.—Of the figure Hyperbaton, *and of the difficulty of defining it.—Of the ſingularity of the Latin arrangement of words, concluding the ſentence ſo often with the verb:—Difference in this reſpect betwixt the Greek and Latin compoſition.--The only way of varying the ſtile of modern languages is by compoſition in periods.—Thoſe who do not think periods beautiful, do not know what beauty is.--The diſadvantages of compoſing in ſhort ſentences:—Weakens the comprehenſion of the hearers or readers:—Makes them unable to ſpeak or read ſuch compoſition.—The taſte and the facility of compoſing in that way, only to be acquired by the ſtudy of the antient authors, particularly Demoſthenes.—A great orator in England formed by reciting his orations.*

I Come now to ſpeak of the compoſition of words in ſentences, which being ſo much more excellent, and of ſo much greater variety, Stile is in Engliſh, from its principal part, not unfitly denominated *Compoſition*. How much the Greek language muſt have been varied in its pronunciation, and how beautifully, by long and ſhort ſyllables, and by grave, acute, and circumflex accents, the one the rhythm the other the melody of the language, I have already obſerved *. What a wonderful variety the accents alone muſt have produced, the reader may imagine, when he conſiders that every accent he ſees marked in a Greek book, and which are now become quite inſignificant, except ſometimes to diſtinguiſh one word from another, were pronounced. The variety of theſe accents was a beauty even of their proſe compoſition, as I have elſe-

* Lib. i. Chap. 5. and 8. of this Volume.

where obſerved *, and ſhall ſay a great deal more of it in the next chapter. And as to their rhythm, that it was perceived in their proſe as well as in their verſe, which was formed by it, and that it was a thing of importance in their rhetorical compoſition, we have not only the teſtimony of Dionyſius the Halicarnaſſian, but the authority of Ariſtotle, who treats of it in his books of *rhetorick* as a material part of the oratorial ſtile †. And if the reader be not ſatisfied with theſe two authorities, and will ſtill believe that there is no ſuch thing as rhythm in Greek or Latin proſe, becauſe it is not in his own or any other modern language, I will add a third, viz. Cicero, who has treated of it at greater length than any of the two authors I have mentioned, in his *Orator*, *ad*

* Lib. i. Cap. 5.

† See the Halicarnaſſian upon this ſubject, *De Compoſitione Verborum*, cap. 25. where he quotes the authority of Ariſtotle, and I think he could not have quoted a better, to prove that what he ſays of the rhythm of the Greek orations was not fanciful. The paſſage in Ariſtotle he refers to is Rhetor. Lib. iii. cap.

*Marcum Brutum**. Now, if the periods of Demoſthenes ſo well compoſed, and pronounced with ſuch variety of rhythms and tones, could not fill the ears of Cicero, they muſt have been indeed, as he ſays, very proud and faſtidious.

As the Engliſh do not make their verſe by long and ſhort ſyllables, they cannot be ſuppoſed to have any *rhythm* of that kind in their proſe. And with reſpect to *accents* ſuch as the Greeks uſed, I believe very few men in England have ſo much as an idea how a language could be pronounced with ſuch a variety of muſical tones, and not be mere cant or ſing-ſong. But their learned ears knew how to diſtinguiſh betwixt the melody of ſpeech and of muſic, properly ſo called, as I have elſewhere explained†. But, tho' we have not rhythm neither in our verſe nor proſe, we have what we call *accents*, by which we diſtinguiſh the ſyllables from one another, not by muſical tones, but by ſounding one louder

* Cap. 51. et ſequens.

† Lib. i. Chap. 5. of this Volume.

than another. In this way we form our verſe; and tho' it give an agreeable pronunciation to our proſe, it has not yet been formed into an art, nor reduced to feet, meaſuring our proſe compoſition, as I have ſhewn, it meaſures our verſe *. But if it be drawn too far back, as is the faſhion now, inſtead of being a beauty to our language, it becomes a great fault in our pronunciation.

The French, as I have obſerved, have neither *quantity*, nor even what we call *accent*, in their language. They cannot therefore have blank verſe, and it makes the pronunciation of their proſe wonderfully uniform, being varied only by a certain tone, which ſome of them give to the laſt words of their ſentences, but which I obſerve is not practiſed by their beſt ſpeakers.

The Italians have *accents* ſuch as we have; they therefore have blank verſe: And I do not obſerve that they uſe their ac-

* Vol. II. of this work, p. 383. and following.

cents ſo improperly as we do, by drawing them too far back; and in general I think their pronunciation is not only ſweet and ſoft, but very diſtinct and articulate *.

As to the modern Greeks, they have converted their antient accents into accents ſuch as ours; and, neglecting quantity altogether, but obſerving the accents as they are marked in the Greek books, they pronounce the Greek juſt as the Engliſh did ſome years ago.

One of the great beauties of antient compoſition, and ſuch as gives it a variety to which it is not eaſy to ſet bounds, is the various arrangement of the words. This is a beauty, which the defects of the grammar of our language will not admit, except in a very ſmall degree, even in our poetry; and ſtill leſs in our proſe, where, beſides the ſtinted genius of our language, cuſtom has confined us ſo much, that to depart

* See what I have ſaid of that language, p. 144. of this Volume.

from one certain arrangement, is reckoned pedantic and affected. In this reſpect, I think the French are at preſent ſtill more ſtinted than we, tho' their language, by having genders and numbers not only in their nouns but in their adjectives and verbs, admits much more latitude.

I have ſaid, that in Greek and Latin it is not eaſy to ſet bounds to the variety of arrangement: But that it had its bounds is certain: For we plainly perceive the arrangement of Cicero to be very different from that of Ammianus Marcellinus, or any other writer of the lower empire; and we ſay the one is claſſical, and the other not. Further, we know alſo, that among the Greeks and Romans, there was an arrangement that was ordinary and familiar, and another that was artificial and not common, being uſed only in particular ſtiles. What the ordinary compoſition was, we may judge from their familiar letters *,

* See the collection of Cicero's letters, *ad familiares*, being the 16th book of his Letters, where the arrangement is ſuch, that the words may be tranſlated

which were, no doubt, written in the ſtile of converſation; but in their laws and decrees, in which the greateſt perſpicuity was ſtudied, the compoſition was ſtill ſimpler and plainer, and coming much nearer to the arrangement in modern languages. This is evident from what is preſerved to us of that kind of writing, among the Athenians and Romans*. The other kind of arrangement is to be found in their rhetorical and poetical works, but chiefly in their poetry, and I think I have obſerved that it is more uſed by the Latin than by the Greek poets; nor do I know any thing in Greek compoſed ſo artificially as the beginning of Horace's ode to Pyrrha.

into Engliſh, in an order not very different from that in which they ſtand in the original.

* In Demoſthenes we have ſeveral laws and decrees inſerted in his orations, where the arrangement of the words is very different from the arrangement in the ſpeeches upon theſe laws and decrees. The ſame inartificial order of words we ſee in the Roman Laws, or *Senatus-conſulta*, and in the edicts of their Praetors, preſerved to us in the collection of their laws made by the Emperor Juſtinian.

Quis multa gracilis te puer in roſa
Perfuſus liquidis urget odoribus
Grato, Pyrrha, ſub antro?

Where, except it be the two prepoſitions *in* and *ſub*, which, being indeclinable words, cannot be connected with the words they govern otherwiſe than by juxta-poſition, there are no other words which are conſtrued together, that are joined together by poſition.

Of this kind of compoſition there is a great deal in his Odes: And it is certainly very proper for that exalted kind of poetry, which ought to ſpeak a language very different from the common. But in his Satires, where both the ſubject and language are of the familiar kind, there is very little of it; nor is there much of it in his Epiſtles, except in one where he ſeems to have thought, that the ſubject required a more elevated ſtile, and a finer flow of verſe than ordinary. The epiſtle I mean, is that to Lollius in praiſe of Homer, where, in deſcribing the ſubject of the Iliad, he ſays,

Fabula, qua Paridis propter narratur amorem
Graecia Barbariae lento collisa duello,
Stultorum regum et populorum continet aestus.

Here the two first lines are as artificial, and flow as well as any of Virgil's.

And this leads me to speak of him, who has used this artifice of composition, called by the rhetoricians *hyperbaton*, more I think than any other poet Greek or Latin. This gives his verse that peculiar flow, which distinguishes it from that of every other poet; and it must be confessed, that there is a sweetness in his composition, not to be found in that of any other Latin poet, as we may perceive by comparing his versification with that of Ovid, who uses it very little, or with that of Lucretius, who does not use it at all, except in the introductions to some of his books*. The reason of this I take

* In the exordium of his first book he makes Venus supplicate Mars to give peace to the Romans, in these admirable lines; where, joined to the finest composition, there is presented to the reader as beautiful a picture as is to be found in any poem.

to be, that it will often happen, that by putting together, in ſo artificial a manner, words of different terminations, the ſound will be made more agreeable to the ear. 2dly, Such an uncommon arrangement gives a wonderful variety to the ſtile, which, as I have more than once obſerved, is one of the chief beauties of writing, and without which, in ſome degree, there can be no beauty in that or any other art. And, Laſtly, I think I have ſhown, that in the beſt writers, this artificial arrangement not only gives pleaſure to the ear, but conveys the ſenſe with more emphaſis than it would otherwiſe be conveyed *. But be the reaſon what it will, we are ſure that the beauty of the periods of Demoſthenes and Cicero, were they to be ſtripped of the artificial arrangement, and the words put together as they are conſtrued in ſyntax, would be entirely loſt;

Hunc tu, diva, tuo recubantem corpore ſancto
Circumfuſa ſuper, ſuaveis ex ore loquelas
Funde, petens placidam Romanis inclyta pacem.

* See the eſſay upon the compoſition of the antients, annexed to Volume ii. of this work.

and the ſame would be the caſe of ſuch artificial verſe as that of Virgil, tho' the quantity of the ſyllables ſhould allow it to be ſo taken down.

But there may be too much of the beſt things; and I muſt own I think Virgil has uſed this artifice too much, particularly in his narrative poem, I mean the Æneid. Whereas Homer, tho' he has uſed it ſometimes in the ornamented parts of the Iliad and Odyſſey, ſuch as the ſimilies *, has very ſeldom uſed it in the narrative; and for

* As in the fine compariſon of Nauſicaa and her maids to Diana and her Virgins;

Οιη δ' Αρτεμις εισι κατ' ουρεος ιοχεαιρα,
Η κατα Τηϋγετον περιμηκετον η Ερυμανθον,
Τερπομενη καπροισι και ωκειης ελαφοισι·
Τη δε θ' αμα Νυμφαι, κουραι Διος αιγιοχοιο,
Αγρονομοι παιζουσι· (γεγηθε δε τε φρενα Λητω.)
Πασαων δ'υπερ ηγε καρη εχει ηδε μετωπα·
Ρεια δ'αριγνωτη πελεται, καλαι δε τε πασαι.
Ως ηγ' αμφιπολοισι μετεπρεπε παρθενος αδμης.

Odyſſ. vi. V. 102.

This ſimile Virgil has imitated in the following manner.

this among other reaſons, the narrative of Homer is much more ſimple than that of Virgil, and very much leſs obſcure.

Qualis in Eurotae ripis aut per juga Cynthi
Exercet Diana choros, quam mille ſecutae
Hinc atque hinc glomerantur Oreades: illa pharetram
Fert humero, gradienſque Deas ſupereminet omnes:
Latonae tacitum pertentant gaudia pectus.
Talis erat Dido, talem ſe laeta ferebat
Per medios, inſtans operi regniſque futuris.

Æn. i. V. 502.

Here we may obſerve, that Homer has excelled Virgil even in the artifice and variety of his arrangement, which, as I have ſaid, is the chief excellence of Virgil's verſification: For he ſeparates Αρτεμις and its epithet ιοχεαιρα, by the words και' ορεος. After that he returns again to *the mountains* and throws in the line Η κατα Τηυγετον, &c. Then he returns a ſecond time to Diana, in the line Τερπομενη κατεροισι, &c. where the reader may obſerve the figure of *like endings*, or *rhyme*, as we call it: Which, I think, is a beauty, and gives not only a variety, but an agreeable flow to the compoſition, when ſparingly uſed, as it is by Homer, never as far as I remember, except in his ſimilies, (See what I have ſaid on this ſubject, in Vol. iii. of this work, p. 84.) where he ſtudies the ornaments of diction more than in the buſy active parts of his poems, according to Ariſtotle's rule, who has ſaid, that the ornaments of ſtile

Before I have done with the arrangement of words, I cannot help obſerving,

ſhould be chiefly employed ἐν τοις ἀργοις μερεσι that is, where the action of the poem ſtands. (*Poetic.* Cap. 24. *in fine*—where the philoſopher adds, what is certainly true, that whatever there are reaſonings or ſentiments and characters expreſſed, that is, τα διανοητικα και τα ηθικα, the ornaments of words ought not to be ſtudied;—αποκρυπτει γαρ ἡ λιαν λαμπρα λεξις τα ηθη και τας διανοιας.)—But to return to Homer: After deſcribing the attendants of Diana, he interjects a kind of parentheſis, where he introduces her mother Latona and deſcribes her joy. Then he comes back again to Diana, who being principal in the ſimile is never out of ſight, and concludes with deſcribing her fine appearance, and eminence above the nymphs of her train. Now this variety of compoſition, which, at the ſame time that it pleaſes ſo much, does not produce the leaſt confuſion, is not to be found in Virgil's lines. Nor is his verſification ſo flowing and high ſounding; particularly in one line, viz. *Hinc atque hinc glomerantur Orcades*, which has no Caeſura, and therefore ſounds diſagreeably. Now, tho' this may be admitted by way of variety in other parts of the poem, it ought not to be in a part ſo much ornamented as the ſimiles ſhould be. With reſpect to the ſenſe and matter of the ſimile, Virgil is ſtill more inferior; for, in the firſt place, he diſtinguiſhes Diana from the nymphs in her train by her wearing a quiver, which certainly was no mark of diſtinction; for they

that, tho' the antient critics ſpeak much of that figure of compoſition they call Hyperbaton, none of them has attempted to define it otherwiſe than by telling us, that it is, as the word imports, putting the words of a ſentence out of their natural order. But what that natural order is they do not tell us, nor do I believe they could tell us, otherwiſe than by reference to common uſe. Now, I am perſuaded, that even in common uſe, there was an arrangement

all had quivers. Then he has omitted the circumſtance that diſtinguiſhes Diana more than any thing elſe, which is, that, tho' they were all handſome, yet ſhe was conſpicuous among them all: And, laſtly, that emphatical deſcription in Homer of the joy of Latona in two words, γεγηθε φρενα, is very inſipidly paraphraſed as I think in a whole line:—See an excellent criticiſm of one Valerius Probus, preſerved to us by Aulus Gellius upon this imitation of Homer by Virgil, where he ſays, what I think is certainly true, *Nihil quicquam tam improſpere Virgilium ex Homero vertiſſe.* And beſides what I have ſaid, he obſerves that the whole ſimile is improper, becauſe there was no likeneſs betwixt Diana hunting with her quivered nymphs, and Dido in the middle of her town, ſurrounded by her Court, and *inſtans operi regniſque futuris.*

different from what we uſe in our language*, and different from that in which a ſchool-boy arranges the words of the learned languages, when he conſtrues them. This I think is evident, from the familiar letters and the edicts and decrees I have mentioned. The difference therefore betwixt the common arrangement and the figured, muſt only be of more or leſs, which would be readily perceived by the Greeks and Romans, but is not to be defined.

Before I conclude this ſubject of the Greek and Latin arrangement of words, I muſt obſerve, that there is ſomething ſingular in the Latin arrangement, which diſtinguiſhes the Latin compoſition from the Greek, or that of any other language I know. It is the poſition of the verb, almoſt always at the end of the ſentence: And if it be a period conſiſting of ſeveral members, it very often likewiſe terminates each of theſe members. Now, as I hold variety to be eſſential to the beauty of lan-

* See of the arrangement in Engliſh, Vol. II. of this work, book iii. cap. 2.

guage and ſtile, this arrangement gives an uniformity and fameneſs to the compoſition, which I muſt own, does not pleaſe me: Nor can it, I think, pleaſe any one, whoſe ear is formed to the variety of the Greek compoſition.

This obſervation upon the Latin compoſition, I have made in the diſſertation upon the compoſition of the antients, annexed to the ſecond volume of this work*; but I will beg leave to ſay a little more here upon the ſubject. If every ſentence was to be concluded with the ſame word, it would, no doubt, be very much worſe, and not to be endured; but it is not, I think, good when the concluſion is with a word of the ſame kind, that is, the ſame part of ſpeech. When I read Latin proſe, I expect the verb at the full ſtop, as much as I do a rhyme at the end of Mr Pope's Diſticks: And, beſides, the terminations of the Latin verbs in *it* and *unt*, in *erit* and *erunt*, *abant*, *ebant*, and *ibant*, are ſounds, which, by themſelves, were very unpleaſant, I am perſuaded, to a Greek ear, even when in-

* Page 587.

terſperſed with the reſt of the compoſition, but much more ſo, when they made a gingle at the end of ſentences, or members of ſentences. It is true that the verb is a principal part of ſpeech, and the glory, as I have ſaid, of the grammatical art, being more artificial, and admitting of greater variety than any other part of ſpeech. It is true alſo, as I have obſerved elſewhere*, that the laſt place of the ſentence is a place of honour, and gives a particular emphaſis to the word that is put there. But, however diſtinguiſhed the verb may be by the grammatical art, in the nature of things the noun expreſſing the *ſubſtance* is prior in dignity to any word denoting an *accident* †. And tho' the concluding verb go-

* Diſſertation on the Compoſition of the antients, Vol. ii. p. 572.

† This the Halicarnaſſian has obſerved before me; for he has ſaid, τα μεν γαρ (τα ονοματα) την ουσιαν δηλουν, τα δε (τα ρηματα) το συμβεβηκος προτερον δε τη φυσει ειναι την ουσιαν των συμβεβηκοτων. *De Compoſitione* cap. 5. This whole chapter and the next are well worth the reading, as they ſhow that it is neither precedence in the nature of things, nor the grammatical conſtruction of the words, that regulates their order and rank in the ſentence.

vern nouns, and perhaps other verbs in the ſentence, yet it may not be the word to which the ſpeaker or writer deſires to draw the chief attention of the hearer or reader, and for that reaſon it may not be worthy of the laſt place, or in that order it may not give an agreeable cadence to the period.

In the compoſition of the beſt Greek writers, I think I have ſhown *, that not only the pleaſure of the ear was ſtudied, but alſo the ſenſe: And if ſo, it was neceſſary that the ſentence or period, and its different members, ſhould be terminated with different parts of ſpeech, ſometimes, no doubt, with the verb; but oftener, according to my obſervation, with ſubſtantives, adjectives (under which I include participles, theſe being as I have ſaid, no other than words denoting *qualities* with the addition of *time* †,) and ſometimes pronouns, and even adverbs, nay

* Ibidem, page 570. and following.

† Page 47. of this Volume.

particles *, which gives a wonderful variety to the Greek compoſition, with reſpect both to the ſound and the ſenſe.

To be convinced that there is not the

* Of this many examples may be given; but I will only mention two, which happen to occur to me in reading the third *Olynthiad* of Demoſthenes; there he ſays, Οτι γαρ εις τουτο περιστησεται τα πραγματα, εαν τα παροντα προωμεθα, σχεδον ισμεν απαντες δη που, p. 22. Editionis Morelli.—Here the concluſion is with two particles of affirmation. In the ſame way he concludes another ſentence in the ſame oration; Ουδε γαρ εν τοις του πολεμου κινδυνοις, των φευγοντων ουδεις ἑαυτου κατηγορει· αλλα και του στρατηγου και των πλησιον και παντων μαλλον. Ηττηνται δ' ὁμως δια παντας τους φευγοντας δη που. Then follows immediately a very ſingular concluſion, with the potential Particle, αν. Μενειν γαρ εξην τω κατηγορουντι των αλλων· ει δε τουτο εποιει ἑκαστος, ενικων αν, Ibid. p. 23. And the ſentence immediately before thoſe that I have quoted concludes with the pronoun of the firſt perſon, in this manner, σαφως οιδα τουτ' εγω. Thus we have, in the ſame paſſage, the ſentences terminated with almoſt all the ſeveral parts of ſpeech, excepting only the participle, which, tho' it happen not to conclude any of the ſentences in this paſſage, is a very frequent concluſion in Greek, for the Greeks, as the antient grammarians obſerve, were φιλομετοχοι.—It may be obſerved, that even when the Greeks terminate with a verb, it is not the governing verb in the ſentence, but an infinitive governed by that verb.

ſame variety in the Latin compoſition, neither in their hiſtorical nor rhetorical ſtile, we need only compare in this view the Greek hiſtories with the Latin, or the Greek orations with the Latin. There is I think no better hiſtorical ſtile in Latin than that of Julius Caeſar, ſo much and ſo juſtly recommended by Cicero. Now, let any man read but the firſt page of his commentaries *de Bello Gallico*, and there he will find every ſentence terminated with a verb, and generally the ſeveral members of the ſentence, as where ſpeaking of the ſeveral nations that inhabited Gaul, he ſays, ‘ *Horum omnium fortiſſimi* ‘ *ſunt Belgae, propterea quod a cultu atque* ‘ *humanitate provinciae longiſſime abſunt*; ‘ *minimeque ad eos mercatores ſaepe comeant* ‘ *atque ea, quae ad effeminandos animos perti-* ‘ *nent, important.*’ And immediately following this, is another ſentence conſiſting of ſeveral more members, all terminated in the ſame way: It is in theſe words, where, ſpeaking of the Helvetii, he ſays, ‘ *Prox-* ‘ *imi ſunt Germanis qui trans Rhenum inco-* ‘ *lunt, quibuſcum continenter bellum gerunt:* ‘ *qua de cauſa Helvetii quoque reliquos Gal-* ‘ *los virtute praecedunt, quod fere quotidi-*

'*anis praeliis cum Germanis contendunt*, '*quum aut ſuis finibus eos prohibent, aut* '*ipſi in eorum finibus bellum gerunt.*' Where we may obſerve, that in the laſt ſentence, there is a quadruple rhyme of *unts*; for there is *gerunt*, *praecedunt*, *contendunt*, and *gerunt* again. Now, compare with this, the narrative of Xenophon (whoſe ſtile, of all the Greek writers, is the likeſt to that of Julius,) in the beginning of the narrative of his *Cyropaedia*; and we ſhall find his clauſules moſt agreeably varied with other words as well as verbs: And one of his ſentences, it may be obſerved, concludes with the adverb 'ενεκα; for he ſays, παντα δε κινδυνον 'υπομειναι του επαιρεισθαι 'ενεκα. And Thucydides, in the beginning of his narrative, where he deſcribes the town of *Epidamnis*, goes on for five ſentences, all terminated with nouns or participles: And it is not till the ſixth ſentence that he concludes with a verb.

In the Latin oratorial ſtile, there is ſtill more of the ſameneſs of compoſition, of which any man may convince himſelf, by

comparing the orations of Cicero with thoſe of Demoſthenes. In the beginning of his oration for Milo, which, I am perſuaded, was more ſtudied in the compoſition than any he ever wrote, tho' as it is ſaid, he failed much in the ſpeaking of it, I have counted above ten periods all concluding with verbs, and even the members of theſe periods ending for the greater part in the ſame way. I will give an inſtance only of one of them: 'Quamobrem illa arma, centuriones, cohortes, non periculum nobis ſed praeſidium *denuntiunt*: neque ſolum ut quieto, ſed etiam ut magno animo ſimus *hortantur:* neque auxilium modo defenſioni meae verum etiam ſilentium *pollicentur*.' And it is well known, that there was one clauſule with a verb, which was obſerved, in his own time, to recur too often in his orations; I mean the *eſſe videatur*: And there is a remarkable paſſage from his *Orator ad M. Brutum*, which I have quoted, in Volume iii.* from which it appears, that in the days of Cicero no compoſition was eſteemed, unleſs the ſentences terminated in a verb.

* Page 54.

What made the Romans ſo fond of ſuch endings, was, I believe, that they thought the verb furniſhed a firm baſis upon which the period might reſt *, and gave it a denſity and a compactneſs, by bringing the ſenſe of it altogether and as it were in a body upon the hearer; ſo that, without ſuch a baſis, the compoſition was looſe and diffluent, as he expreſſes it in the paſſage above quoted. And it is, no doubt, for the ſame reaſon, that the Greeks uſe it more in their rhetorical ſtile than in any other. But as I have obſerved more than once, there can be no beauty of ſtile without variety. And beſides, it will often happen, that the verb is not the moſt important word in the ſentence, and therefore not entitled either to the firſt or laſt place, as I think I have ſhown, in my Treatiſe above quoted, '*upon the compoſi-* '*tion of the antients.*' And accordingly Demoſthenes, as appears from the exam-

* The Halicarnaſſian commending a period of Plato, ſays, that Βασιν ειληφε ασφαλην.—(Περι της δεινοτητος του Δημοσθενους, cap. 24). Yet it does not end with a verb; for it runs thus, Εργῳ μεν ἡμιν διδ' εχουσι τα προσηκοντα σφισιν αυτοις, ὡν τυχοντες, πορευονται την 'ειμαρμενην πορειαν.

ples I have given, very often chooſes to conclude his periods with ſome other part of ſpeech. And, if the reader be not ſatisfied with theſe examples, he may find many more of the ſame kind in the ſame Olynthiac, particularly in that famous paſſage, ſo much admired by the Halicarnaſſian *, where he compares the Athenians of his time with their anceſtors. This compariſon begins with theſe words, Καιτοι σκεψασθε, Ο ανδρες Αθηναιοι, 'α τις αν κεφαλαια ειπειν εχοι των τ' επι των προγονων 'εργων και των εφ' 'υμων. Then he goes on for two folio pages of the edition I uſe, where, I ſay, that there are more periods and members of periods terminated by other parts of ſpeech, than by verbs. The whole oration is well worth the reader's peruſal; for I think it the fineſt thing of the kind, both for matter and ſtile, I ever read: And particularly Demoſthenes has ſhewn in it, that he well deſerves the praiſe, which even his enemy Eſchines beſtowed upon him, and which the Halicarnaſſian † tells us,

* Περι της δεινοτητος του Δημοσθενους, cap. 22.

† Περι της δεινοτητος του Δημοσθενους cap. 55. and 57.

was ſo clear, that it could not be diſputed, of excelling all other orators in compoſition.

The Latins, I obſerve, in their epiſtolary ſtile, have not near ſo much of it; which perſuades me, that, in their converſation, of which the epiſtolary ſtile is an imitation, it was not ſo common. And accordingly Cicero in his dialogues does not uſe it ſo much. But in all their grave compoſitions, ſuch as their hiſtories and orations, it is very much uſed. And even in their didactic ſtile they uſe it more than the Greeks; as we may judge by comparing Cicero's *books de officiis*, with Ariſtotle's didactic works, and particularly his *Treatiſe on poetry*, where you may read whole pages without the concluſion of one ſentence by a verb.—And ſo much with reſpect to the arrangement of words in the antient languages.

In the modern, ſuch as the French and Engliſh, the verb not being ſo artificial a part of ſpeech, nor of ſuch importance in the ſentence, there is no ſuch uniformity

in their compoſition; nor indeed do I obſerve, that there is one kind of word in them that concludes the ſentence oftner than another.

From what I have here ſaid, and in other parts of this work, it is, I think, evident, 1*mo*, That we cannot vary our compoſition by the arrangement of words, as the antients did. 2*do*, Neither can we do it by long and ſhort ſyllables; for beſides the defect of the modern languages in that particular, our ears are ſo little formed to that kind of rhythm, that even in reading the antient verſe we do not mark it as we ſhould do*: And, *laſtly*, as to the accents or melody of their language, as they called it, we have hardly an idea of it.—It remains therefore, that the only variety we can give to our ſtile, is by compoſition in periods, fitly divided into members of different lengths and ſtructures, and variouſly connected together. Whoever, therefore, compoſes in ſhort ſentences, where the ſubject makes periods proper, appears to me to

* Vol. II. Book ii. Chap. 6.

be entirely ignorant of the beauty of compoſition, nor indeed to know that there cannot be any beauty in any art without variety, and that variety cannot be, except where there is a whole of ſome extent or ſize. And accordingly we obſerve, that this ſhort cut of a ſtile, as I call it, which has been introduced among us from France, but is not at preſent ſo faſhionable as it was ſome years ago, is tediouſly uniform and diſguſting to the ear, which in matter of compoſition muſt be the judge, ſince, as I have elſewhere obſerved, reading is the teſt of good writing *. The ear is alſo offended by the frequent breaks or ſtops, which make a kind of bounding hopping ſtile, without any thing like that flow, that *flumen orationis*, of which the antients ſpeak ſo much. And beſides all this, I maintain that the ſenſe, collected in a well compoſed period, comes upon you more fully and forcibly, than when it is cut into ſhreds, and frittered down into ſhort and unconnected ſentences. I will add, that the compoſing in this way has a bad effect upon the readers or hearers; for it weakens their com-

* Introduction to Volume iii. p. 4.

prehenſion, by accuſtoming them to take in the ſenſe only in ſmall parcels, and broken down as it were into pap to feed children. Now, the moſt valuable faculty of the human mind, is *comprehenſion*, by which we are enabled to ſee a whole at once. In acquiring this faculty, as in acquiring other habits, the mind muſt proceed by degrees, and before it can take in a whole oration, an epick poem, a tragedy, or a ſyſtem of ſcience, it muſt have learned to comprehend a period. Further, by not being accuſtomed to ſuch compoſitions, one becomes unable to read or pronounce what is compoſed in the antient way, or even to underſtand it, tho' it be ever ſo well read to him; and he is in the caſe of a young beginner to learn Latin, who will not underſtand the moſt ſimple and ordinary compoſition in that language, till the words are put in the order of conſtruction to which he has been accuſtomed in his own language. It is alſo to be conſidered, that to pronounce ſuch compoſition, a good deal of breath is required, and one muſt be well-winded, according to the common expreſſion. Now, that is to be acquired by

practice: And accordingly we are told, that Demoſthenes, by exerciſes of different kinds lengthened his wind, which was naturally ſhort, ſo as to be able to pronounce his long periods *una continuatione verborum*, as Cicero ſays *, that is *in one breath.* Mr Garrick, the famous player, not having practiſed the ſpeaking of ſuch kind of compoſition, very different from that of Shakeſpeare, which he had been accuſtomed to ſpeak, could not, as I have been well aſſured, pronounce the periods of Milton †; and therefore he avoided acting

* Cicero, *de Oratore*, Lib. i. cap. 61.

† There is a period in Satan's ſpeech to Beelzebub, in the firſt book of Paradiſe loſt, conſiſting of no leſs than ſeventeen lines running into one another; in which, tho' it be ſo well compoſed that I think the ſenſe is perfectly clear, thoſe, who are not accuſtomed to ſuch compoſition, are, as I have obſerved, very apt to loſe their way. But the ſcholar knows, that nothing can be truly beautiful, which has not a certain extent and greatneſs. See Ariſtotle's *Poetics*, cap. 7. The running the lines into one another, as Milton does, not only makes the verſification more beautiful by making the pauſes more various, but gives to verſe

in any play compoſed in that way*: And perhaps that was the reaſon which made him refuſe the beſt play, as it is now generally acknowledged to be, in the Engliſh language; I mean the Douglas, a great part of which is compoſed in periods†. The ſtudy of the antient authors will form our taſte to that kind of compoſition; and if we join to the ſtudy of them, the practice of tranſlating and reciting them, we ſhall acquire the habit of writing and ſpeaking in

the beauty of proſe compoſition in periods, as the Halicarnaſſian has obſerved. See the paſſage from him quoted, Vol. ii. p. 396. But Shakeſpear, not being a ſcholar, and having no idea of this beauty, commonly terminates the ſenſe with the verſe, ſo that the ſtop muſt always be at the end of the verſe; which makes his verſification almoſt as uniformly tedious as our rhyming verſe, compoſed all of ſentences conſiſting each of ten ſyllables, with a gingle at the end of every ſecond verſe.

* This anecdote I had from the late Mr Glover, who was very well acquainted with Mr Garrick, and, being himſelf a play-writer, attended the theatre very much.

† I doubt there are very few players now in Britain, that can ſpeak, as they ought to be ſpoken, the

periods, ſo as to do it as it were naturally. For ſuch is the force of cuſtom, as the Halicarnaſſian has obſerved, that by it we can bring ourſelves to do with eaſe the moſt difficult things, even to compoſe and pronounce ſuch periods as thoſe of Demoſthenes; and for proof of this he gives an example, which to me is moſt convincing, of our learning the grammatical art, by which we are taught to know all the differences of words, and to read and write readily and eaſily,—a moſt wonderful art, he ſays*. He might have added a more wonderful art ſtill, which we acquire by mere imitation and practice, without being taught, or indeed without being capable of learning the grammatical art, or any other; I

firſt eight lines of this play, where the verſes are run together, and the ſenſe ſuſpended to the end, in a way never uſed in rhyme, and very ſeldom in blank verſe as it is now compoſed. This compoſition ſhould be ſpoken in ſuch a way, that the verſe ſhould be marked not only by the accents, but by ſome little ſtop at the end of the verſe, but much ſhorter, and of a different kind from the pauſes which the ſenſe requires. This is a matter of pretty nice diſcrimination.

* [illegible]

mean *ſpeaking*. The practice of reciting the orations of antient authors I would recommend particularly to thoſe who would form themſelves to be public ſpeakers. I have heard that the Marquis of Wharton formed his ſon, the Duke, to be one of the greateſt, and at the ſame time one of the readieſt ſpeakers that ever was in England, by making him get by heart whole orations of Demoſthenes, and repeat them with all the graces of action and pronunciation.

How much ſtile may be varied by tropes and figures, I have explained at length in the preceding volume. And I ſhall only add here, that in this, and every thing elſe which varies and embelliſhes the ſtile, a meaſure muſt be obſerved, and there muſt not be too much any more than too little. For, in that conſiſts the το πρεπον or what is decent and becoming, which is required in every art, and without which there can be nothing truly beautiful in any art*. Yet it is not comprehended in a-

* See what the Halicarnaſſian ſays upon the ſubject of the το πρεπον, in his admirable treatiſe περι της δει-

ny art or ſcience, nor can it, by the nature of the thing, be ſo comprehended, according to the opinion of the Halicarnaſſian, tho' Gorgias, as he tells us, endeavoured to reduce it to an art*. Before I come to ſpeak of it, I will beſtow a chapter more upon ſome things relating to the Greek compoſition, which were reduced to an art among them.

νοτητος του Δημοσθενους, cap 48. where he ſays, that if what is becoming and ſuitable to the ſubject is not ſtudied, no other beauty in the diction will be of any value. And in this, he ſays, as well as in other virtues of an orator, Demoſthenes was moſt eminent.

* Περι συνθεσεως ονοματων, cap. 12.

CHAP. V.

The beauty of the Greek compoſition perceived even by the people.—Of the difference betwixt a learned and an unlearned judge, in the matter of oratory and of popular writing.—The art of compoſition beſt learned from Dionyſius the Halicarnaſſian;—he divides the art into two branches, the choice of the words, and the joining them properly together.—This laſt, the moſt difficult of the two.—Two things required to make fine compoſition, that it ſhould be pleaſant, and that it ſhould be beautiful.—Theſe muſt depend upon the elements of ſpeech properly joined together.—Of the letters, the ſyllables, and the words in Greek.—Of the changes which their orators made upon their words.—The compoſition of words into periods, of great variety and beauty.—Four things required to make fine compoſition, melody, rhythm, variety, *and*

what is ſuitable or proper to the ſubject. —Of the melody of the Greek language. —Different tones upon different words in other languages as well as the Greek, but not regulated by art.—Of the rhythm *in Greek.—Shown that there is a rhythm in the proſe as well as the verſe.—A difference of rhythms ſuited to different ſtiles in proſe.—Of the difference betwixt the rhythm of verſe and of proſe.— The mind much affected by rhythm as well as by other kinds of motion.—The greateſt excellence of proſe is to reſemble verſe, and of verſe to reſemble proſe — This explained.—Proſe reſembles verſe by rhythm,—but it muſt not be the rhythm of verſe —Examples given in the Greek Lyric poetry, of rhythms that do not appear to be regular or meaſured.—Examples of ſuch rhythms in Demoſthenes.— That there are ſuch rhythms in proſe, atteſted by Ariſtotle as well as by the Halicarnaſſian.--Of poetry in Engliſh in which the verſe is concealed.—Of proſe in Engliſh reſembling verſe.—How verſe is made to reſemble proſe.—Examples of this from Homer and from Milton.—Of*

variety in the proſe ſtile.—That abſolutely neceſſary to make it pleaſant.—There muſt be a variety not only in the words, but of the rhythms *and the* melody.—*Little variety at preſent in our Engliſh proſe.—Milton imitates the antients in this as in other things.—Opinions of certain critics in the days of the Halicarnaſſian, that Demoſthenes did not labour his words ſo much as the Halicarnaſſian ſuppoſes.—Anſwer to this objection.—The writing of* numerous proſe, *tho' difficult at firſt, becomes eaſy by practice.—Examples of this from other arts.—The art of fine ſpeaking and writing more difficult than the other arts;—requires greater labour to excell in it.—A great memory neceſſarily required in an antient orator.—An art of memory among them, unknown in modern times.—The nature of this art.—If the moderns excell or equal the antients in oratory, it muſt be by ſuperiority of genius.—Commendation of the Halicarnaſſian's writings.*

THAT there is a wonderful beauty in the Greek compoſition, not only in verſe but in proſe, and particularly in their orations, every man, who underſtands their language, and has any natural taſte or ſenſe of what is beautiful, muſt acknowledge; for not only can the people judge of an oration when it is ſpoken, and can determine very juſtly upon the merit of different orators whom they hear, but they can judge alſo of an oration when they read it. And I am of the opinion of Cicero, that, in the matter of oratory, there is no difference between the judgment of the learned and of the unlearned; for oratory, and ſpeaking or writing upon any ſubject belonging to common life, is a popular art, which being addreſſed to the people, muſt pleaſe them, otherwiſe it would not be good of the kind. And tho', as the ſame author obſerves, the people may approve of a very ſorry orator, not having heard a better, yet when they have an opportunity of hearing a better, and ſo making the com-

pariſon, they will give the preference to the beſt *.

Is there then no difference, it will be ſaid, betwixt the judgment of the learned and the unlearned in this matter? My anſwer is, that there is a very great; for the people, tho' they be pleaſed, and rightly pleaſed, cannot give any rational account why they are ſo: Whereas, the learned judge can inform them by what ſkill, and what arts, the orator is able to pleaſe them ſo much †. In ſhort, he underſtands the art, while they only perceive the effects of it.

In what this art conſiſts, no author that I know, has explained ſo well as the author I have ſo often quoted, the Halicarnaſſian, in two treatiſes that have come down to us, the one of them upon the ſubject *Of the compoſition of words*, and which we have entire; the other upon the ſtile

* Cicero *De Claris Oratoribus*, cap. 52. and 53.

† Cicero, ibidem, cap. 54.

of Demoſthenes; but this is a good deal mutilated and imperfect in many places. In the treatiſe on compoſition, he begins, after the manner of the antients when they treat of any art or ſcience, with the firſt principles of the art, and examines the nature of the firſt elements of ſpeech, I mean the letters; then he proceeds to ſyllables, from ſyllables to words, and from words to ſentences and periods. And indeed it is evident, that the pleaſure of the ear, about which he only inquires in this treatiſe, muſt depend upon all theſe.

The ſpeaking or writing art conſiſts, he ſays, of two things, the choice of the words, and the compoſition; of theſe, the compoſition is by far the moſt difficult; and tho' it be laſt in practice, he ſays, it is firſt in dignity and excellence: This he proves, by comparing it with other arts, ſuch as architecture, where the preparing and poliſhing the ſtones is not near ſo great an art as the putting them together in the building, and alſo by examples from authors, and particularly from Homer, who of

the moſt common words, has, by the art of compoſition, made moſt beautiful poetry *.

To make compoſition fine, he requires two things, *firſt*, That it ſhould be pleaſant or ſweet: And, *ſecondly*, That it ſhould be beautiful †, under which he includes the grave and the dignified. That both theſe things muſt depend upon the five things I have mentioned, viz. the letters, the ſyllables, the words, the ſentences, and the periods, is evident.

As to the Greek letters, I have already obſerved, that the Greek language has in it all the elemental ſounds, which the human mouth, as far as I know, is able to utter. And, in this reſpect, it is different from many other languages I have taken occaſion to mention. I have alſo obſerved, that it compounds ſome of theſe elemental ſounds, making diphthongs both proper and improper: And the Halicarnaſſian, in

* Ibid. cap. 2. and 3.

† The το ηδυ and the το καλον, as he expreſſes it, Ibid. cap. 10.

what he writes upon the ſubject of the letters, obſerves, that they compound alſo conſonants, making what they call *double* conſonants, of which they have three marked by the characters ψ, ζ, ξ, all compounded of the σ for one of the ſounds, the firſt of π and ς; the ſecond of κ and ς; and the third of ς and δ; the σ being firſt in the laſt of them, according to the account the Halicarnaſſian gives of its compoſition *, if there be no error in the MSS. or printed editions: So that we ought to ſay, not Νομιδσω, as it is uſually pronounced, but Νομισδω †.

As to ſyllables, I have likewiſe obſerved, that the Greek ſyllables are almoſt all compoſed of letters that join eaſily together, to make one ſound; and that they have no ſyllables compounded of many conſonants, ſome of them mute, ſome of them liquid, ſome of them aſpirated, and ſome

* Ibid. cap. 14.

† That this is the true pronunciation, and that there is no error in the MSS. or printed editions, I think Lambert Bos, in his Greek Grammar, p. 36. has very clearly proved.

of them not aſpirated; ſuch as the word *ſtrength* in Engliſh, in which there are no leſs than ſix conſonants, and the laſt of them aſpirated, of which termination there is no example in Greek.

Of ſyllables are compoſed words, which by flexion undergo wonderful changes, as I have ſhown, in the ſeveral genders, caſes, tenſes, numbers, and perſons.

The next compoſition is of words into ſhort ſentences, or Κωλα, as they are called by the Halicarnaſſian: And here he obſerves an art of compoſition which is peculiar to the Greek language; for, ſays he, in order to make the compoſition in theſe ſentences pleaſant, we muſt not only chuſe words that fitly join together, and give thoſe words ſuch a form by flexion, as ſuits beſt the place they are in; but if even with that, they do not make a pleaſant ſound, we muſt alter them by what he calls μεταϛκευη, that is by adding, taking away, or altering letters. Examples of this will readily occur to every one that is learned in the Greek language; and the

Halicarnaſſian furniſhes two from Demoſthenes *.

The next and laſt compoſition, and which crowns the whole work, is of the ſentences into periods, which, as it is the greateſt compoſition of all, there is in it the greateſt variety, and conſequently the greateſt beauty.

All theſe things being attended to, one ſhould think the compoſition would be complete. Antient art, however, did not ſtop here, but required four things more, to make the compoſition pleaſant or beautiful, or both; the firſt is melody, the ſecond rhythm, the third variety, and the

* One of them is where Demoſthenes inſtead of ſaying εις τουτον τον αγωνα ſays, εις τουτονι τον αγωνα, in the beginning of the famous oration *pro Corona*; again, he ſays, in the beginning of the oration againſt Ariſtocrates, Μητ' ιδιας εχθρας μηδεμιας 'ενεκ' ἧκειν, where we obſerve an apocope of the vowels ε and α. And he obſerves alſo, the leaving out or adding the letter ν in the firſt aoriſts, ſuch as εγραψε; and he mentions alſo their uſing αφαιρησομαι in place of κφαιρεθησομαι, ibid. cap. 6.

fourth, which he ſays ought to accompany theſe three, is, what is becoming and ſuitable to the ſubject, or the το πρεπον in one word *.

What the melody of the Greek language is, I have explained at pretty great length in the ſecond volume of this work, and have mentioned it in ſeveral paſſages of this volume. I ſhall only add here, that, but for the Halicarnaſſian, we ſhould have known no more of the ſcience of it, than we do of the practice, and ſhould have believed, that there was no more art in the Greek accents, than in the Chineſe, or thoſe of ſome barbarous nations, or even our own, which we know are various, as I have obſerved, and different upon different words and ſyllables, but we cannot reduce them to any rule. There are, however, ſeveral, who will not believe, even upon the credit of the Halicarnaſſian, that ever any language was ſpoken as he ſays the Greek was ſpoken. But, in the firſt place, I think, no man who has learned

* Ibid. cap. 11.

but the elements of muſic, can deny, that it is poſſible to ſlide up and down a fifth upon the ſame word, or even upon the ſame ſyllable of a word, if it be a long ſyllable. The Chineſe, who pronounce the ſame monoſyllables with ſo many different tones, ſpeak with as much eaſe as other men, tho' their tones are not regulated with any art, as far as I know. And, 2*dly*, I think it can as little be denied, that a variety of tones, conducted by art and rule, would make an agreeable melody. And, *laſtly*, I think it is probable in the higheſt degree, ſetting aſide the authority of the antient authors, that a people ſo muſical as the Greeks would join muſic to their language, and make an art of it as much as of muſic, vocal or inſtrumental; from which, as the Halicarnaſſian tells us, the melody of this language differed only in degree, not in kind or quality*. But ſuch arguments, I know, will be loſt upon thoſe who only learn the antient languages, but who do not make

* Τῳ ποσῳ ου τῳ ποιῳ, Ibid. cap. 11.

what I think the proper uſe of them, which is to live in the antient world, and there to ſtudy the men and the manners, the arts and the ſciences. Unleſs we do ſo, it is very natural to believe that men are and always have been the ſame, in all ages and nations; and that the antient languages, tho' different from the modern, as we ſee one modern language is from another, are no better in any reſpect.

This notion, of men and their arts having been always the ſame in all ages and nations, would diſpoſe ſuch critics to believe, that all that we read in the Halicarnaſſian, in Ariſtotle, and in Cicero, of the rhythm of the antient proſe, was mere imagination: But they have at leaſt the idea of the rhythm of long and ſhort ſyllables; tho' we have not the practice of it, even in reading the antient verſe*. None of theſe gentlemen, however, will be ſo bold as to deny that the antient verſe was formed by this rhythm, and not by accent, ſuch as that with which we read it. And, as their

* Vol. II. book ii. cap. 6.

proſe was compoſed in the ſame language as their verſe, it is impoſſible to deny, that their ears muſt have perceived the quantity of the ſyllables, in the one as well as the other: And if ſo, I think it is alſo impoſſible to deny, but that they muſt have judged the rhythms in one proſe compoſition, to be more agreeable than in another.

The only queſtion therefore is, whether this rhythm of proſe can be reduced to an art, as well as the rhythm of verſe? Now, this is done both by Ariſtotle and the Halicarnaſſian, and particularly by the Halicarnaſſian, who has told us the feet that are proper for the grave and dignified compoſition, or for ſuch as is rather pleaſant and ſweet than grave *. And he has illuſtrated his doctrine by examples from the beſt proſe writers, whoſe compoſitions he has ſcanned, and meaſured by feet, as carefully as we do Greek or Latin verſe; and ſhown that the feet they uſe are very well ſuited to that colour of ſtile in which they write; and, to illuſtrate this matter

* Ibid. cap. 17. and 22. 23.

further, he has contraſted the rhythms of thoſe good writers, with the rhythms of a very bad writer, of his own time as it appears, one *Hegeſius* * ; for, as he tells us in another place, the art of that numerous compoſition began to be loſt about his time. And he ſhows us, that proper rhythms not only give a beautiful colour to the ſtile, but are imitative and expreſſive, particularly of motion, of which he gives a fine example, from the deſcription of Syſiphus and his ſtone in Homer †. If any body be not convinced of the effect of rhythm in proſe, by what Ariſtotle and the Halicarnaſſian have ſaid, I refer him to Cicero in his book entitled *Orator*, where, in the paſſage I have quoted from him above, he ſpeaks of all compoſition without numbers as looſe and diſſolute, and no better than the language of vulgar men. He there examines the matter moſt accurately, and inquires, *firſt*, Whether there be ſuch a thing as rhythm in proſe, which he determines

* Ibid. cap. 18.

† Cap. 20.

very clearly in the affirmative: And, 2*dly*, Whether the feet, which conſtitute that rhythm, are not the ſame with the feet that make verſe. And he ſays they are, and ſhows what poetical feet are proper for the rhythm of proſe*. And, in the ſame place, he gives us the hiſtory of this art of numerous proſe, which, being the completion of the oratorial ſtile, was not diſcovered till later times †.

But how are we to diſtinguiſh the rhythm of verſe from that of proſe? And the Halicarnaſſian tells us, that it is by the rhythm of verſe being exactly meaſured, and the ſame rhythms returning again at certain intervals: Whereas the rhythm of proſe is not reſtricted to any certain meaſure; nor does it return at certain intervals, but is diffuſed thro' the whole compoſition, and uſed by the writer or ſpeaker in ſuch a manner, as, he thinks, moſt agreeable to the ſubject he treats. And he compares the mixture

* Cap. 56. and 57.

† Ibid. cap. 52.

of the different rhythms in the ſame compoſition, to the mixture of colours in a picture, which is very different, according to the genius and taſte of the painter, or the ſubject of the picture *.

That thoſe rhythms of the antient proſe, as well as of the antient verſe, muſt have had a wonderful effect upon the minds of the hearers, I cannot doubt. And I believe what the Halicarnaſſian ſays, that there is nothing of ſuch power to pleaſe the ears, or affect the mind †: For, as I have obſerved elſewhere, it is by motion, more than by any thing elſe, that paſſions and ſentiments are expreſſed; and accordingly, it is in that way the *pantomime art* moves us more perhaps than any other art. Now, rhythm is nothing but various modifications of the motion of the voice. In ſhort, it is juſt what Time in muſic is; and what the effect of that is, every muſician knows.

* Cap. 21.

† Περι της δεινοτητος του Δημοσθενους, cap. 39.

I think it is a fine obſervation of the Halicarnaſſian, that, with reſpect to the compoſition, (for he ſpeaks only of that part of ſtile, not of the choice of words), the greateſt beauty of proſe is to be like verſe, and of verſe to be like proſe*. This requires ſome explanation, and accordingly he gives it†. As to proſe reſembling verſe, he tells us, that verſe has a certain regular meaſure returning at certain intervals, at the diſtance of one verſe, as in the heroic poetry, or of ſeveral, as in ſtrophes and antiſtrophes in the lyrick poetry; and it conſiſts of certain feet arranged in a certain order: Whereas proſe has no regular return of the ſame rhythms, nor is it confined to certain feet in a certain order, but mixes them together as the writer thinks proper; the conſequence of which is, that good proſe is ευρυθμος, or ευμετρος, not ερρυθμος, or εμμετρος, as verſe is; and again, with reſpect to the accents and tones, it is ευμελης, not εμμελης, as muſic is. Theſe

* Ibid. cap. 20. *in fine.*

† Cap. 25.

terms I cannot render in Engliſh, becauſe as we have not the thing, we have not the words for it; but after what I have ſaid, I am ſure the Greek ſcholar will underſtand them; or if I have not ſufficiently explained the matter, let him have recourſe to the Halicarnaſſian himſelf, who has explained them much more copiouſly and elegantly than I am capable of doing; and he has taken the more pains to do it, that, as it appears from what he ſays, it was a myſtery to the critics of his time; therefore he invites thoſe only, to hear ὁις θεμις εστι, θυρας επιθεσθε βεβηλοις, the form of words they uſed in the myſteries.

What makes the matter very clear to my apprehenſion, is the example he gives of certain ſpecieſes of the Greek lyrick poetry whereof the periods or ſtrophes as they were called, were ſo long, and ſo much varied in the compoſition, that the regular return of the meaſure was forgot*; and in the dithyrambic poetry, he tells us, they mixed the different melodies of the diatonick, the

* Cap. 26.

chromatic, and the en-harmonic *, and the Dorian, Phrygian, and Lydian modes †. So that the muſic was as much varied as the poetry; and the rhythms of the poetry were ſuch, that it might be ſaid to be, like the orations of Demoſthenes, ευρυθμος not ερρυθμος.

The examples of ſuch numerous compoſition in proſe he takes chiefly from Demoſthenes; and particularly from two orations of his, the one the famous oration for *Cteſiphon*, and the other againſt Ariſtocrates ‡, where he is at pains to ſhow, that the rhythms in thoſe orations were not accidental, but ſtudied: And he compares them to ſundry pieces of poetry, where there are the ſame rhythms, only Demoſthenes has added perhaps or taken away a foot, that it might ſtill continue proſe.

* Cap. 19.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. cap. 25.

I muſt confeſs, that my ear is not ſo learned, nor I believe is any modern ear, as to perceive thoſe rhythms. But that is no reaſon, why we ſhould diſbelieve what ſo great a critic as the Halicarnaſſian, and himſelf too ſo fine a writer, ſays of them. Or if we ſhould not give credit to the Halicarnaſſian, I think it is impoſſible we can reject the authority of Ariſtotle, who tells us, as the Halicarnaſſian does, that the ſtile of oratory muſt have rhythms, tho' at the ſame time, it muſt not be metre or meaſured rhythm: And he mentions the metrical feet that he thinks proper for oratory *.

But tho' we cannot perceive the rhythms of Demoſthenes, there is certainly a great deal of art in his ſtile, but more concealed than that of any other writer I know, ſo much as not to be diſcovered, except by a learned reader, who has formed his taſte upon the ſtudy of the beſt antient authors, and knows the art, by which, of common words, ſuch as thoſe of Demoſthenes, an uncommon

* *Rhetorica*, lib. 3. cap. 8.

ſtile may be formed. But of the ſtile of Demoſthenes, which the Halicarnaſſian, I think, with great juſtice, conſiders as the moſt perfect ſtile of oratory, I ſhall ſay a great deal more in the ſequel.

What the Halicarnaſſian ſays, of numbers being concealed even in poetry, may be illuſtrated from ſome Engliſh poetry we have, ſuch as the beginning of the *L'Allegro* and *Il Penſeroſo* of Milton, and particularly from Dryden's ode to St Cecilia, where the rhymes are ſometimes at ſuch a diſtance from one another, that the ear hardly perceives them, nor diſcovers that ſome of the lines do not rhyme at all with any other; and when, beſides that, the verſes are of ſuch unequal length, and differing alſo ſo much in meaſure, ſome of them being *iambics*, others *trochaics*, others *anapeſts*, I think they may be accounted rather meaſured proſe than poetry, but, at the ſame time, more pleaſant to my ear than any regular verſification we have.

What in our proſe comes the neareſt to the looſe numbers, which the Halicarnaſ-

ſian requires in fine proſe, is the rhapſodies of Theocles in Lord Shafteſbury's dialogue, entitled *the Moraliſts*; only the numbers are not concealed as the Halicarnaſſian would have them to be, but are too apparent, and therefore make the compoſition to be like poetry. There is ſome meaſured proſe of the ſame kind, written by his kinſman the late Mr Harris, and ſubjoined to his dialogue upon art. The numbers in it are better concealed, but the words are not ſo ſplendid; nor is there ſo much of good compoſition in periods, but the ſenſe and matter are very good.—And ſo much the reſemblance of proſe to verſe.

As to the making verſe like proſe, this is done by compoſing poetry, as we do proſe, in periods, and making the periods and their ſeveral members cut the verſe, and run into different verſes. Of this he gives ſome beautiful examples from Homer *, the greateſt author, according to his judgment, that ever wrote, and the moſt perfect mo-

* Chap. 26.

del of every beauty of ſtile, either in the words or compoſition *. Of this Milton's blank verſe in the *Paradiſe Loſt* is as good an example as we could have; for we have there periods often of ten or twelve lines, and one I have obſerved in Satan's firſt ſpeech to Beelzebub, in the firſt book, of no leſs than twenty-one lines, divided among the ſeveral verſes; which has a fine effect, giving to verſe all the beauty and variety of proſe compoſition †. How different, in this reſpect, the blank verſe of Shakeſpeare is from Milton's, every reader of taſte and judgment muſt obſerve.

The third thing required to make a fine ſtile is variety, without which, as I have more than once ſaid, there is no beauty in language any more than in ſtile, nor indeed in any work of art. For, as the Halicarnaſſian has obſerved, variety is by na-

* Chap. 24.

† See what I have further ſaid on this ſubject, Vol. II. p. 396.

ture ſo agreeable to us, that nothing pleaſes us without it; ſo that even the fineſt and moſt pleaſant things do not pleaſe us if long continued without variation*; and he requires, that there ſhould not only be a change of words of different kinds, ſome long and ſome ſhort, and with different flections; and ſometimes compoſed into periods of different members of various lengths, and ſometimes in ſhort ſentences without periods, with a variety too of rhythms; but even the tones, he requires, ſhould be varied, ſo that words of the ſame tone ſhould not be put together†.

How much variety is wanted both in our verſe and proſe at preſent, we may judge by comparing them with thoſe of Milton, who in this, as well as every

* Cap. 19. and cap. 12. where he ſays, Μεταβολη παντος εργου χαριεν ἡδυ. Homer has ſaid long before him,

Παντων μεν κορος εστι, και ὑπνου και φιλοτητος.

† Chap. 12. and 19.

thing elſe, has imitated the antient compoſition as far as the ſtinted genius of his language would permit him. How agreeably he has varied his verſe by compoſition in periods of different lengths, conſiſting too of members different both in length and number, I have juſt now obſerved; and as to his proſe, I have given, in the third Volume of this work *, an example of his ſkill in compoſing rhetorical periods. As to his plain ſtile, didactic or narrative, he periodiſes it alſo, but in a manner very different. Of this plain ſtile you have a very good example in his preface to the *Paradiſe Loſt*, which, tho' it be not ſo much varied in the compoſition as his rhetorical ſtile, (nor indeed ought it to be ſo), has nothing of that tedious uniformity, which is to be obſerved in our preſent writings.

I will only add upon this ſubject, that, as I have elſewhere obſerved, to make a fine period, there muſt not only be variety in the compoſition but in the matter;

* Vol. iii. p. 51.

becauſe it gives occaſion to vary properly the tone of the voice, which is the greateſt beauty of pronunciation, either in ſpeaking or reading. The players often do this affectedly, and merely to avoid a monotony. This, I think, is more diſagreeable, than even a monotony, if the ſenſe require it ſhould be ſo ſpoken. But where that is the caſe, it is a fault in the compoſition, which is not to be found in the preface that I have mentioned, where there is variety enough in the matter, as well as in the ſtructure of the words, to make a variation of voice, both proper and neceſſary for making the ſenſe well underſtood. Let the reader compare the compoſition of this preface, with the preſent Engliſh and French compoſitions, (I name them together, becauſe I am afraid they are too like one another), and if he has any taſte or judgment, he will perceive the difference more clearly than any words can explain it. As to Milton's Latin, there is as much variety in it as in any Roman writer. In this beauty of ſtile, more if poſſible than in any other, Demoſthenes excels; and is in that way peculiar-

ly diſtinguiſhed from Iſocrates in Greek, and Cicero in Latin.

I ſhould now ſpeak of the fourth thing, which the Halicarnaſſian requires to make a fine ſtile, I mean *decorum* and *ſuitableneſs to the ſubject*: But of this I am to treat in the next chapter; and I will conclude this with ſome obſervations, which naturally ariſe from what I have ſaid.

And, in the firſt place, tho' it be evident from what I have ſaid, that we cannot have tones and rhythms, ſuch as adorned the antient languages, yet I do not think it impoſſible to vary our proſe compoſition agreeably by our accents. Of this I have given a hint in my third volume * of this work. Our poetry is undoubtedly made by accents, and by accents only and a certain number of ſyllables in our blank verſe. Of theſe we compoſe feet of different kinds, as I have ſhown elſewhere †,

* Page 49. and 50.

† Vol. II. p. 383. and following.

ſuch as iambic, trochaic, and anapeſtic. Now, I know nothing to hinder us to give to our proſe certain numbers by a proper mixture of theſe feet, not returning regularly in a certain order, as in our poetry, but ſo diffuſed thro' the ſtile, as to affect the ear agreeably. The great fault I find with the proſe of that kind, which has been attempted in Engliſh, is that only one of theſe feet is uſed, namely the iambic, and ſometimes ſo uſed as to make an entire heroic verſe, ſuch as we find in Lord Shafteſbury's rhapſody. Now, I would have the other two feet likewiſe uſed: In this way Milton has diverſified his verſe, very finely I think, in the *Comus*; and I am not ſure but our proſe ſtile might be agreeably varied in the ſame way, without being run into poetry. Cicero has made the ſame obſervation with reſpect to the rhythms of antient proſe, and finds fault with Ariſtotle for confining that rhythm to one foot, viz. the *paean*; whereas he thinks, that other feet, ſuch as the *dactyle* and *anapeſt*, may be admitted, and in ſhort all feet, but ſo varied and blended together, that the compoſition may appear not looſe

or diffolute, yet not altogether numerous or poetical *. Theſe obſervations upon the numbers of our Engliſh proſe, I only throw out as conjectures, of which perhaps ſomething may be made by thoſe who have more leiſure than I to ſpeculate upon ſuch ſubjects. One certain way of varying not only our ſtile in proſe, but likewiſe in verſe, I have already ſuggeſted; I mean by compoſition in periods of various lengths, and conſiſting of members differing both in length and number. And in theſe periods, there may be uſed thoſe ornaments of which I have treated at ſome length elſewhere †, by which like is referred to like, contraries oppoſed to contraries, with a like ſtructure or compoſition of words, and clauſules or cadencies of the ſame kind. Such ornaments our language admits; and theſe, ſays Cicero ‡, do of themſelves give numbers to the ſtile. But they muſt not be intem-

* Orator, cap. 57.

† Vol. III. p. 85. and following.

‡ Orator, cap. 65.

perately or immoderately uſed, otherwiſe they become diſguſting, and in hiſtory or narrative of any kind, they deſtroy the appearance of truth and reality.

In the next place, the Halicarnaſſian tells us, that there were thoſe in his time, who could not be perſuaded that Demoſthenes was at ſo much pains, and beſtowed ſo much time in meaſuring ſyllables, and joining words ſo artificially together in periods, or members of periods, and in ſhort, ringing all the changes upon them poſſible. This they thought a drudgery, that no man of ſpirit could ſubmit to *. And, indeed, I do not wonder that the art of compoſition being, as he tells us, for the greater part loſt in his time, there ſhould be critics that did not think that it ever was practiſed, to the degree of perfection mentioned by the Halicarnaſſian. Neither am I much ſurpriſed, that modern critics, who have not made an accurate ſtudy of the pronunciation of the Greek language,

* *De Compoſitione*, cap. 25

and of all the powers of the human voice, ſhould doubt whether it was poſſible, that any language could be ſpoken with ſuch a variety of rhythms and accents as he deſcribes: Whereas, the critics of his time, when the Greek was ſtill a living language, and ſpoken with all that variety, could not but believe that it was poſſible to compoſe ſuch proſe as he has deſcribed, though they might not believe that ever it was practiſed, or if practiſed, could have ſuch effects as he aſcribes to it.

The anſwer, which the Halicarnaſſian makes to this objection, I think, is a good one. He ſays, that at the time Demoſthenes compoſed thoſe orations, the art of writing was ſo much ſtudied at Athens, and particularly by Plato and Iſocrates, that their compoſitions appeared to be poliſhed and turned, as it were in a turning loom. Iſocrates, he ſays, beſtowed ten years at leaſt, ſome ſay more, upon a ſingle oration, viz. his *Panagyric*. And Plato did not give over labouring in the arrangement and trimming of words, when

he was eighty years of age, as appeared from his pocket book when he died, in which the firſt ſentence of his work upon Polity was found variouſly arranged. As therefore Demoſthenes laboured ſo much, as is well known he did, to excell every body in the oratorial art, he thought it was neceſſary for him to labour the words as well as the matter, and to make his orations pleaſe the ear as much as the underſtanding. If, ſays the Halicarnaſſian, ſculptors and painters beſtow ſo much time and pains in executing every the leaſt thing belonging to their art in the higheſt degree of perfection, how can we ſuppoſe that Demoſthenes would be at leſs pains, working, not upon corruptible materials ſuch as they wrought upon, but upon ſuch as were to laſt for ever, and to acquire him much greater glory than they could aſpire to. This example, from theſe other arts he mentions, appears to me to be very convincing: For we know, from what remains of the antient ſtatues, that beſides the noble ideas expreſſed by them, and the grace and elegance of the figures, there is an exactneſs, and what we would

call a minuteneſs in the execution, that is really wonderful; for the marble is poliſhed in the higheſt degree; and all the ſinews and muſcles ſo finiſhed, that nothing can exceed it.

The Halicarnaſſian then proceeds to tell us, that however operoſe and difficult ſuch elaborate compoſitions as thoſe of Demoſthenes might be at firſt, yet by aſſiduous practice, they would be performed at laſt with tolerable eaſe; and he gives an example to prove this from another art, which I think very appoſite. A man, ſays he, who has learned and practiſed muſic very much, will upon the firſt hearing of a new piece, be able with very little trouble to perform it: And accordingly now-a-days, we ſee that a girl, who has practiſed the harpſicord much, will be able almoſt at ſight to perform a new piece, and will play you at once three or four parts of a tune, after ſhe has ſtudied it a little, with ſo much eaſe, that ſhe will be talking to you all the while.

At the ſame time I am perſuaded it is true, what the Halicarnaſſian ſays, that ſuch orations as thoſe of Demoſthenes, could not have been compoſed without great labour, greater I believe, than any work of painting, ſculpture, or muſic. But after the compoſition was finiſhed, the labour was not at an end; for the moſt difficult part of the orator's art remained to be performed; I mean the ſpeaking, or what they called the *action*: Under which they included not only the geſture of the body, which was very conſiderable, (for beſides the action of their arms, they walked backward and forward, or to either ſide, as I am told the pleaders in Italy do at this day), but the look and action of the face in ſpeaking, and alſo the management of the voice, or what we call the pronunciation *. Now action, as Demoſthenes tells us, was the firſt, the ſecond, and the third quality

* Cicero, *de Oratore*, Lib. i. cap. 5. Quid ego de actione ipſa plura dicam, quae motu corporis, quae geſtu, quae vultu, quae vocis conformatione ac varietate moderanda eſt? Quae ſola per ſe ipſa quanta ſit, hiſtrionum levis ars et ſcena declarant.

of an orator: And the more I attend to public ſpeaking, the more I am convinced of the truth of the obſervation; for it is by it chiefly that the character of the ſpeaker is indicated, one of the three great ſources of perſuaſion mentioned by Ariſtotle, and more by it than by what he ſays are the paſſions of the hearers excited, which are the ſecond ſource of perſuaſion according to Ariſtotle: And even the arguments from the nature of the thing, the third and laſt ſource of perſuaſion, have a very much greater effect when well ſpoken, than they have otherwiſe.

But there is ſtill more in the art of the antient orator: For, before the ſpeech is pronounced, it muſt be got by heart; as it does not appear that thoſe antient orators uſed any notes while they were ſpeaking; and yet, among the many defects of orators, which Cicero mentions, I do not remember that any where he ſpeaks of want of memory, except once, where he tells us, that the orator's memory having failed him,

he ſaid he was bewitched *. It is therefore not without reaſon that Cicero ſays, that without memory, every thing elſe in an orator, however great and excellent, is of no ſignification †. Now, there was among them a thing utterly unknown in modern times, I mean an art of memory; for every thing among them appears to have been reduced to art and rule: And indeed I think it is impoſſible, that without ſome ſuch art they could have pronounced orations ſo very long, and ſo very well compoſed, that they could not have been ſpoken extempore. But we are not left to argument or conjecture upon this ſubject; for that they had an art of memory, is a fact ſo well atteſted, that we cannot doubt of it. Cicero has ſpoken of it at ſome

* *Orator*, cap. 37.

† Cicero *de Oratore*, lib. 1. cap. 5. The words are. 'Quid dicam de theſauro rerum omnium memoria, 'quae, niſi cuſtos inventis cogitatiſque rebus et verbis 'adhibeatur, intelligimus omnia, etiamſi praeclariſſima 'fuerint in oratore, peritura.'

length in his ſecond book *de oratore*, as a thing of common uſe at that time; for he ſays, that it is *res nota et pervulgata*. And he tells us, that not only things were preſerved in the memory by this art, but even words *. The author of the books, *ad Herennium*, by ſome critics aſcribed to one Cornificius, but undoubtedly the work of an antient rhetorician, treats more fully of it, and is at a great deal of pains to make us underſtand wherein the art conſiſts †. Both Cicero and he agree in this, that it was by a reference to ſenſible objects that the memory both of things and of words was preſerved. They therefore imagined to themſelves certain places or *loci* as they called them, ſuch as houſes or porticos; and in theſe they conceived certain images of things and of words, which places and images ſuggeſted to them whatever they were to ſay. The author, *ad Herennium*, compares the *places* to the

* Lib. 2. *de Oratore*, cap. 87. and 88.

† Lib. 3. *ad Herennium*, cap. 16. and 21.

wax or paper on which they wrote, the *images* to the letters and words compoſed of thoſe letters, the diſpoſition and placing of thoſe images to the writing, and the pronunciation to reading *. As to the images for the words, Cicero obſerves, that that there were ſome words, of which there could be no natural image or repreſentation, ſuch as the words that connect the ſeveral parts of diſcourſe, commonly called conjunctions: But of theſe, ſays he, we muſt, from our own imagination, form images which we are conſtantly to uſe †. By this art, he tells us, in the ſame place, that the natural memory was not oppreſſed or impaired, as ſome people imagined, but greatly improved. And it was not only practiced in Rome, but in Greece; for Antonius, who there ſpeaks, ſays, that he himſelf knew two famous men in that country, *Carneades* and *Sceptius Metrodorus*, who both ſaid that they could in thoſe *places*, in their memory, fix the images of things and words, as they could fix letters in wax.

* Ibid. cap. 17.

† *De Oratore*, lib. 2. cap. 88.

Whether this art, from the account given of it by thoſe two authors, could be revived and practiced now a days, I will not take upon me to ſay. But we are aſſured by both of them, that the uſe of it could not be learned without the greateſt diligence and moſt aſſiduous practice. Yet it was but a ſmall part of the orator's art among the antients, and is now thought ſo little neceſſary, that it is not at all ſtudied. But, when we join to it all the other parts of the art practiced among the antients, and all that variety of things which an orator muſt know to be perfect of his kind *; —And when to all this we further add certain qualities of the body, not required in any other of the fine arts, ſuch as a fine perſon, a commanding aſpect, and a clear and ſtrong voice,

* Craſſus, in Cicero *de Oratore*, requires that he ſhould be learned in all arts and ſciences; and indeed, if he is to ſpeak eloquently upon any of them, he muſt underſtand it; and, even in ſpeaking upon any common ſubject, he may uſe illuſtrations from arts and ſciences, which will both adorn his ſtile, and ſerve to make his ſubject better underſtood.

——populares
Vincentem ſtrepitus, et natam rebus agendis *,

I think we muſt conclude, as Cicero does, that it is a moſt wonderful art, and that no other reaſon can be given why ſo few have excelled in it, even in countries ſuch as Greece and Italy, where ſuch rewards were propoſed to excellence in it, " *niſi rei quandam* " *incredibilem magnitudinem ac difficulta-* " *tem* †.' One part of the art only, I mean the compoſition, tho' not the greateſt in the opinion of Demoſthenes, required, as I have deſcribed it, a diligence and attention, ſuch as there is no example of in our time: So that, if we equal or excel, as ſome imagine, the antients in the writing art, it muſt be by a wonderful ſuperiority of genius, which enables us with very much worſe materials, and much leſs induſtry, to make finer or even as fine compoſitions.

To thoſe who are not of that opinion but who think as I do, that we never could

* *Horatii Epiſtola ad Piſones*; ſee the quotation from Cicero upon this ſubject, p. 191.

† *De Oratore*, lib. 1. cap. 5.

have invented nor cannot excel in any of the fine arts, except by the imitation of the antients, I would earneſtly recommend the reading and the ſtudying diligently of the Halicarnaſſian's critical works, without which, I think it is hardly poſſible to be a great performer, or even a good judge in the writing art. In Ariſtotle's poetics and his books upon rhetoric, we have the general and philoſophical principles of criticiſm and good taſte very accurately laid down. But Dionyſius is more particular and inſtructs you as accurately and minutely, as I believe he did his pupils he taught at Rome, to one of whom he dedicates his work *upon compoſition*, which i have ſo often quoted. I read him with the greateſt pleaſure, not only for the *matter* but for the *ſtile*, which, as far as I am able to judge, is truly Attic, and the moſt copious as well as moſt elegant ſtile of criticiſm that is extant. I do not think that he deſerves at all the cenſure of Photius upon ſome Attic writers, that they are too Attic; by which he means, that their ſtile is ſo artificial as to be obſcure, which I think is true of one great Attic writer, namely Thu-

cydides. This fault the Halicarnaſſian has noted in him, but I think has himſelf avoided altogether; for, unleſs where his text is corrupted, I think he is a very clear author, ſo clear that, in many places, a good Greek ſcholar can, at the firſt reading, correct the error of the manuſcript. Hudſon's edition from the Oxford preſs is an excellent one; only I think he ſhould have taken into the text all the corrections from MSS. which he mentions at the bottom of his page, particularly from the Vatican MS. And there are ſome emendations ſuggeſted by ſuch critics as Sylbrugius and Harry Stephen, which are ſo evident, that I think he ought to have admitted them into the text, and degraded the common reading to the bottom of the page: And I ſhould be very glad if the learned in Oxford would take the trouble to publiſh an edition of him in that form, and without a tranſlation, ſo that it might be carried about in two or three pocket volumes. For it is a book that a ſcholar ought

Nocturna verſare manu, verſare diurna.

CHAP. VI.

In judging of what is proper in writing, the ſubject only to be conſidered.—Stile, *divided according to the ſubject, is of ſix kinds,*—1. Epiſtolary ſtile,—*ſhould be conciſe, and without any thing like compoſition in periods.—The ancients excelled in that kind of writing as well as in every other.*—2. Dialogue writing,—*That nothing elſe but converſation written.—Of the ſtile of converſation,—few excel in it.—Bodily qualities neceſſary for that excellence.—Some ſo deficient in theſe, that it is impoſſible they can converſe agreeably.*—Speaking *and* moving *diſtinguiſh a gentleman and lady more than any thing elſe.—Both ſtudied more in France than in Britain.—Defects of pronunciation in private converſation may be corrected.—Of the fault of too faſt ſpeaking.--Of the con-*

trary extreme.—Of ſpeaking too ſlow and with an affected gravity.—Of too ſtrong emphaſis in ſpeaking.—Too much ſtudy to ſpeak well muſt not be ſhown in private converſation.—Provincial and profeſſional dialects to be avoided.—Verſes well repeated, an ornament of converſation.—Of politeneſs in converſation;—four things required in order to be polite.

WHAT is *decent*, *proper*, and *becoming* is principal in all the arts, being that, without which no performance in any art can pleaſe; yet it is not nor cannot be comprehended in any art, as Cicero informs us*: Nor can it be otherwiſe perceived, but by a natural ſenſe of the *pulchrum and decorum*, which is the foundation of excellence in all the arts, but which no art or teaching can beſtow, if nature has denied it.

* (Cicero *De Oratore*, lib. i. cap. 29.) And for this he quotes a great artiſt in his time, I mean Roſcius, ſo great, that a man, who excelled in any art, was ſaid to be 'a *Roſcius* in that art.'

What is fit, decent, or proper in the practice of the writing art, depends upon three things: The nature of the ſubject; the character of the writer; and, *laſtly*, the character and diſpoſition of the perſons to whom he writes. The two laſt conſiderations belong to public ſpeaking or oratory, rather than to writing; for the author may be altogether unknown, or, if known, his character has commonly nothing to do with his work; and as to thoſe to whom it is addreſſed, it is the world in general for whom moſt authors write. It is therefore the ſubject of the writing which I ſhall only conſider, as that which muſt determine what is fit, proper, and becoming in the ſtile and manner of treating it.

According to this way of conſidering ſtile, there will be ſix different kinds of ſtile to be examined: The epiſtolary ſtile; The dialogue ſtile; The narrative or hiſtorical; The didactic; The rhetorical; And, laſtly, the poetical. I will begin with the epiſtolary.

As the ſubject of a letter is commonly the ordinary affairs of life, ſuch as are

talked of in converſation, the ſtile of it, as well as of converſation, ſhould be plain and ſimple, conſiſting of words of common uſe, and without periods or any thing that can be called compoſition. It ſhould be leſs diffuſe than the ſtile of converſation, but it muſt have nothing of the affected and obſcure brevity of Tacitus. It may be compared with the philoſophical ſtile in this reſpect, that it ought to be both accurate and conciſe, and without any aſcititious ornaments: And therefore it is not to be wondered that Ariſtotle, whoſe philoſophical ſtile is ſo admirable, ſhould excell ſo much in letter writing, as we are told he did *. There are no letters of his preſerved; but there are many of other antients, more than ſufficient to ſhew their excellence in that kind of writing, as well as in every other †.

* Vol. iii. of this work, p. 353.

† In p. 206. of the ſame Volume, I have given the words of a letter of Lentulus, preſerved to us by Salluſt. I will give here the words of a letter of Julius Caeſar, to his friends Appius and Cornelius, which Cicero has preſerved to us, lib. ix. *epiſt. ad Atticum* epiſt. 16.

I am now to ſpeak of the ſtile of dialogue, which, being no other than a writ-

'*A. D. vii. Id. Mart. Brunduſium veni: ad murum caſtra poſui. Pompeius eſt Brunduſii; miſit ad me Cn. Magium de pace. Quae viſa ſunt reſpondi. Hoc vos ſtatim ſcire volui. Quum in ſpem venero de compoſitione aliquid me conficere, ſtatim vos certiores faciam. Valete.*'

If his Commentaries had been written in the ſame ſtile, it would, no doubt, have been approved of by the late French writers, particularly by Monteſquieu, who writes great works much in the ſame ſtile. But the ſtile of Caeſar's Commentaries is quite different; and is, I think, the beſt memoir-ſtile that ever was written, though it has not that elaborate compoſition, which a formal hiſtory requires. I will mention another letter of Julius, which has more of compoſition in it, very ſuitable, I think, to the noble ſentiment expreſſed in it. It is alſo preſerved to us by Cicero, in the 10. book of his letters to Atticus, epiſt. 9.; and appears to be an anſwer to a letter of Cicero, in which he told Caeſar, that ſeveral of the Pompeian faction, who had fallen into his hands and whom he had diſmiſſed, had taken up arms againſt him. The words are, '*Neque illud me movet, quod ii, qui a me miſſi ſunt, diſceſſiſſe dicuntur, ut mihi rurſus bellum inferrent; nihil enim malo, quam et me mei ſimilem eſſe, et illos ſui.*' See what I have further ſaid upon the epiſtolary ſtile of the ancients, p. 218. of this volume; where I have ſhown, that in their epiſtolary ſtile

ten converſation, muſt of neceſſity imitate the ſtile of real converſation. This leads me naturally to ſay ſomething of that ſtile, for which I do not find any precepts given in any antient author: And Cicero ſeems to doubt, whether it could be reduced to an art. But he adds, that tho' there were very many maſters of rhetoric, there were none of the ſtile of converſation, as there were none who deſired to learn it*. But whether it be reducible to art or not, it is certain that it is better and worſe performed; and though it be of more common uſe than any art, it is ſurpriſing how few excel in it. The reaſon of this is, that, beſides taſte and judgment, converſation, as well as public ſpeaking, re-

they made much leſs uſe of that artificial arrangement of words, which their language permitted, than in other ſtiles. And in general it may be obſerved, that by compoſition the antients diverſified their ſtile much more, than by the choice of words; for it is by the arrangement of the words, and by compoſition in periods, that Demoſthenes has made, of common words, the fineſt proſe ſtile that ever was written.

* *De Officiis*, lib i. cap. 37.

quires ſome bodily talents not commonly met with. And firſt, there muſt be a good voice, ſweet and clear, if not ſtrong and commanding like that of a public ſpeaker. I have known ſome, who were bleſſed by nature with ſo ſweet a tone of voice, that almoſt every word they ſpoke went to the heart of the hearer. Then there muſt be a diſtinct articulation, a pleaſant look, and an agreeable action of the face in ſpeaking. In all thoſe natural endowments, I have known many ſo deficient, that it was impoſſible, by any teaching or practice, to make them agreeable in private converſation, any more than good public ſpeakers.

There are two things which diſtinguiſh a gentleman and lady in company, more than any other thing I know. Theſe are moving and ſpeaking, both of which we have occaſion to practice as often as we are in company, but neither of which is ſufficiently cultivated in Britain. In France, the grace of motion is very much ſtudied, and the people of that country have ſo high a taſte of beauty, that they prefer the beauty of that kind to the beauty of ei-

ther face or ſhape; and it is undoubtedly by nature preferable, as it is more expreſſive of mind, the ſource of all beauty, than either of the other two. They are therefore at pains to form every motion a gentleman or lady has occaſion to make in company, and particularly their motion when they firſt enter a room. And the effect of this culture is very viſible in their behaviour; for I have frequently ſeen a Frenchman, without any advantages of face or perſon, enter a room, and preſent himſelf, as they call it, with an air and preſence that ſurpriſed me *. Nor is the other accompliſhment, of ſpeaking agreeably, neglected among them: And accordingly I have known many French gentlemen and ladies, who excelled alſo in that qualification.

Of theſe two ſo eſſential parts of education, one is almoſt entirely neglected in

* The higheſt eulogium the French can make upon a man's perſon, is to ſay Il a l'air noble; on the other hand, the worſt thing they can ſay of a man's appearance, is Il a l'air ignoble.

Britain; I mean the grace of motion, which is but too viſible in the appearance and behaviour of many of our people of the firſt rank. The other is cultivated in the ſchools of England, but only in the way of public ſpeaking, the tone and manner of which is, and ought to be, quite different from private converſation, but upon which there is no attention at all beſtowed; and the boys are allowed to prate in private as they think fit. Neither is it minded by their tutors and preceptors when they grow up and come into the world; the conſequence of which is that, as I have ſaid, ſo few ſpeak well in converſation. Now, it is evident that defects of voice, articulation, and action, may in ſome degree be remedied, and any natural advantages improved by art and teaching. And particularly there is one very great fault in ſpeaking, and which prevails more and more every day, eſpecially among the young people, that might be entirely cured, if parents and maſters would give a proper attention to it. The fault I mean is

ſpeaking too faſt. In my younger days, the people of faſhion in England ſpoke with a certain gravity and dignity becoming their rank; and there was a remarkable difference in that reſpect betwixt the city and the court end of the town. Now, a young gentleman of the firſt rank talks or rather prates like a waiter in a city tavern, in ſuch a glib, pert, flippant manner, as to me is very offenſive, and indeed, ſometimes not intelligible. At the ſame time the contrary extreme is to be avoided; for we ſhould not ſpeak too ſlow, nor affect a gravity and dignity which only belong to public ſpeaking, and this too upon great and important occaſions. Nor ſhould we lay too many or too ſtrong emphaſes: For that is a fault even in public ſpeaking, becauſe it deſtroys the ſmoothneſs and flow of the ſpeech, making it proceed by hops and bounds; and beſides, if there be too many emphaſes, there is truly none at all. There are many who ſpeak too low, more than ſpeak too loud, at leaſt in good company. But we ſhould ſuit the pitch of our voice to the number of the company. There are many too,

who ſpeak while they are laughing: But this is not right. To ſpeak with a ſmile is agreeable, eſpecially if the action of the face in ſmiling is beautiful. But to ſpeak and laugh at the ſame time, is not graceful; and beſides, it makes the pronunciation inarticulate, and very often not intelligible. As to the words, they ſhould be of common uſe, and not affectedly learned, or *Johnſonian*, as I have heard them called *. And there ſhould be nothing like compoſition in periods in private converſation, any more than in letter writing; and in general, we ought not to ſeem to labour to ſpeak well. This perſons are apt to do when they ſpeak any language other than their native; and I have particularly obſerved it in Scotſmen

* There is a definition of *Network* in Johnſon's dictionary, which has been ſhown me, and, I think, is a curioſity of the kind. '*Nettwerk*,' ſays he, 'is Any 'thing reticulated or decuſſated at equal diſtances, with 'interſtices between the interſections.' This may not be a good definition of Network, but it is a very good deſcription of the author; for nothing characteriſes a pedant more than the uſe of hard words, not intelligible except to a few, in deſcribing a common thing.

who have learned to ſpeak Engliſh after they were become men, and who, though they ſpeak it well, may be diſcovered by a nice ear to ſpeak a language that is not native to them. It was in this way, that the herb woman in Athens diſcovered Theophraſtus, when he was cheapening ſome of her herbs, to be a foreigner; for he ſpoke, as ſhe ſaid, *Nimis Attice*, though he had been then twenty years, as I remember, in Athens: But it ſeems, the habit he had formed, when he firſt began to ſpeak the Attic, ſtill remained with him.

There is an Attic in every country, as well as there was in Greece. The Attic in England is the language of the court and of the univerſities. But there are many provincial dialects: And beſides theſe, there is what may be called a profeſſional dialect, belonging to men of certain profeſſions; for I have obſerved ſeveral gentlemen of the law, and more of the clergy, who had not been much in good company, ſpeak in a tone and manner very different from people of faſhion, and which I thought not at all beautiful. Such peculiarities ought to be

avoided. And, laſtly, I would adviſe the ſtudent of this art of converſation, to learn to repeat *with good accent and good diſcretion*, verſes in Engliſh or any other language, which he and the company may underſtand, and to acquire that *ſuavitas oris*, which, Cornelius Nepos tells us*, recommended Pomponius Atticus ſo much to the great men of Rome. And indeed, good verſes, properly introduced and well repeated, are in modern times, as they were in antient, one of the greateſt ornaments of converſation.

A good deal more might be ſaid upon the ſubject of converſation: And it is a ſubject worthy to be treated of at much greater length; for it is in converſation that politeneſs is chiefly ſhewn. Now, I don't know that, in the ſtate of ſociety in which we live, there is any greater enjoyment than polite converſation, which may be conſidered as productive of the greateſt bleſſing of human life, friendſhip. But my ſubject confines me to ſpeak only of

* *In vita Attici*, cap. 1. 4. et 20.

the ſtile of converſation; however, as I have mentioned politeneſs, I will add that four things appear to me to be neceſſary ingredients of politeneſs. In the *firſt* place, a general benevolence or love of mankind, which makes what the French call the *politeſſe naturelle*, and without which politeneſs is mere form and etiquette. Now, there are many men of this age, that have not in their nature the philanthropy of a Newfoundland dog, who will not bark or growl at a ſtranger who comes to his maſter's houſe at a proper time, but, on the contrary, will fawn upon him, bidding him as it were welcome to the houſe. Nay, I know men, who are not only wanting in general benevolence, but have not that attachment to any one of their own ſpecies, which every dog has to his maſter. *2do*, A polite man muſt know the company in which he converſes, and what meaſure of reſpect is due to each of them. For an undiſtinguiſhing civility, without regard to rank, worth, ſenſe, or knowledge, is not politeneſs. *3tio*, He muſt be ſo much of a philoſopher, as to know himſelf, and not to aſſume more, in re-

gard of any of the particulars above mentioned, than belongs to him. In one word, he muſt not be vain; for vanity, tho' it may be concealed for ſome time, will break out upon certain occaſions, and give great offence to thoſe you converſe with. And, *laſtly*, a man, in order to be polite, muſt have the ſenſe of the *pulchrum* and *decorum*, and of what is graceful and becoming in ſentiments and behaviour, without which there is nothing amiable or praiſe-worthy among men. And, as this ſenſe is the foundation of all virtue, it was not, I think, without reaſon that the Stoics reckoned politeneſs, or *urbanity* as they called it, among the virtues.

CHAP. VII.

Dialogue writing *is converſation upon the ſubject of ſome art or ſcience.—Not a mere catechiſm, but of the poetic kind, having a fable with characters and manners; —not therefore real converſation, ſuch as the Socratic converſations recorded by Xenophon.—Plato the great dialogiſt of antiquity.—His dialogues fictions even as to the* matter.*—Some of them admirable pieces of poetry;—but he does not ſucceed when he delivers whole ſyſtems of ſcience in that way.—Ariſtotle's manner in ſuch works much better.—The ſtile of dialogue ſhould be ſimple.—Plato's ſtile not ſo in ſome of his dialogues.—A poetical arrangement of the words affected by him. —Cicero the next great dialogiſt of antiquity;—his manner quite different from Plato's:—Wherein that difference conſiſts. —His ſtile alſo very different from Plato's;—great variety of matter in his phi-*

loſophical dialogues.—The ſect of philoſophy, to which he was addicted, furniſhed arguments upon both ſides of a queſtion. —They are full alſo of examples from both Greek and Roman hiſtory.—The rhetoric of them better than of his orations,—his dialogues on the ſubject of eloquence, and in general his writings upon eloquence, the beſt part of his works.—Eloquence the delight and ſtudy of his life;—philoſophy he only applied to when he could do nothing better.—Nothing therefore new or excellent in his philoſophical works;—but his rhetorical, admirable of the kind.—Only two rhetorical dialogues;—of theſe the one De Oratore, *the beſt thing that ever Cicero wrote;—it is perfect of the kind, having both fable and characters:—The perſonages in this dialogue;—not all the ſame the ſecond day that they were the firſt:—The difference accounted for:—The time and place of the dialogue marked:—The endurance of it alſo:—That more conſiſtent with probability, than the length of ſome of Plato's diſputations:—It is divided into*

two days.—The diſputation of the firſt contained in Cicero's firſt *book.—The ſubject of that diſputation.—The ſecond day's diſputation divided into two converſations; the one in the forenoon, the other in the afternoon.—The forenoon's converſation comtained in the ſecond book.*—Antonius *the ſpeaker there, who goes thro' all the ſubject matter:—The narration is agreeably diverſified by one of the perſonages explaining that part of eloquence, which conſiſts in pleaſantry and facetiouſneſs.—The* third *converſation in the afternoon of the ſecond day.—This contained in Cicero's third book.—The ſcene of it changed.*—Craſſus *the chief ſpeaker there, who explains all the ornaments of ſpeech.—The exordium of this third book very fine, and very pathetical, giving an account of the calamities, which after that befel the commonwealth, and in which moſt of the ſpeakers in that dialogue periſhed.—Of the grand idea of an orator which Craſſus had.—It comprehends, according to him, the knowledge of arts and ſciences.—In antient times, the knowledge of things and words was*

not divided.—This diviſion firſt made in the ſchools of philoſophers.—Anſwer to the objection that it is impoſſible to learn ſo many things.—A pauſe after this in the converſation, which is interrupted by Cotta putting Craſſus in mind of the province he had undertaken, which was to explain the manner *of an oration, as Antonius had done the* matter *;—Craſſus accordingly explains the ornaments of ſingle words;—of words in compoſition;—of rhythms ;—of what is* decent *and* proper; *and* laſtly, *of* pronunciation *and* accent.—*Cicero concludes the dialogue, with a compliment to his friend Hortenſius from the mouth of Craſſus.—Of the* decorum *obſerved in this laſt day's converſation with reſpect to thoſe who ſpeak.—The ſpeech of Craſſus the moſt laboured part of the dialogue.—Cicero there gives his own idea of the perfect orator.—That idea a true idea ;—without that univerſal knowledge, an orator cannot be rich in the ornaments of ſpeech, nor have that elevation of mind neceſſary for a great ſpeaker.—He cannot be ſuch a ſpeaker as Pericles.—The dialogue upon the whole*

the fineſt part of Cicero's works.—Of his treatiſe De Senectute,—*not a dialogue, but a moſt pleaſant little compoſition.—A tranſlation of it into Greek by Theodorus Gaza.—Another little treatiſe of Cicero* upon Friendſhip.—*That comes nearer dialogue than the former.—Some general obſervations upon Cicero's dialogues.—Cicero more happy in the choice of the perſonages of his dialogues than Plato.—Alſo much greater politeneſs in Cicero's dialogues than in Plato's.—The beſt ſchool of politeneſs to be found, is in Cicero's dialogues.—Cicero's dedication of his works to ſome friend much to be approved of.—Thoſe dedications ſhow, that he had a heart capable of friendſhip.—The advantages of philoſophy, friendſhip, and the ſociety of ſuch men as he lived with in thoſe days, and in theſe.*

DIALOGUE writing is nothing elſe but converſation in writing, not converſation however upon the ordinary

affairs of life, but upon matters of art or ſcience. It was by converſation among men of leiſure collected together in colleges, ſuch as the prieſts of Egypt were, that, I believe, arts and ſciences were invented: And I am ſure, that, at this day, they are beſt taught in that way; for the ſcholar both learns and remembers beſt, when, in the way of queſtion and anſwer, he is made to teach himſelf *.

But dialogue writing muſt not be a mere catechiſm of art and ſcience. There muſt be character and manners in it, and ſomething of a fable or ſtory. It is therefore a kind of poetry; and though it may be founded in fact, as moſt of the fables in poetry are, there muſt likewiſe be a great deal of invention in it, otherwiſe it will be a ſorry dialogue. I hold therefore, that the converſations of Socrates recorded

* There is a fine example of this in the *Meno* of Plato, where an illiterate ſlave is by Socrates made to teach himſelf a curious problem of geometry.

by Xenophon, being real converſations, are not dialogues properly ſo called, any more than a real ſtory, that has happened in life, is a tragedy or a comedy; for in every thing of the poetical kind, there muſt be what the painters call ideal beauty, and which is not to be found in nature, but only in the works of artiſts.

The moſt famous writer of dialogues in antient times, is Plato; and his dialogues are undoubtedly fictions, ſometimes even as to the matter: For he has put into the mouth of Socrates a great deal of that τερατωδης σοφια of Pythagoras, as Xenophon calls it, meaning no doubt, that abſtruſe metaphyſical philoſophy which Plato had learned in Egypt, or from the Pythagoreans*. There is a ſtory or fable in all of them, with circumſtances of time and place as well as of perſons. And in ſome of them, ſuch as *the Gorgias* and *Protagoras*,

* See Xenophon's epiſtle to Eſchines, preſerved to us by Stobaeus, and printed at the end of Stephen's edition of Xenophon.

the characters and manners are ſo well painted, and ſuch turns and incidents, and what may be called *peripeteias* contrived, that I think them very compleat dramatical pieces. In ſuch dialogues I think he is admirable; but when he comes to deliver whole ſyſtems of polity and government, as he does in his *books of polity and laws*, where the ſame converſation is carried on through ten books in the one, and twelve in the other, the dialogue is loſt, ſuch a fiction being out of all bounds of probability: Nor are the characters preſerved; for even the irony of Socrates is laid aſide, and in the books I have mentioned, inſtead of pretending to know nothing, he becomes a dogmatical teacher. In ſuch long works, I think it muſt be allowed, that the plain didactic manner of his ſcholar Ariſtotle is better.

As dialogue is converſation, the ſtile of it ſhould be ſimple; but as the ſubject of it is much above the ſubject of ordinary converſation, ſo the ſtile of it may be more raiſed. Plato's ſtile, ſays the Halicarnaſ-

ſian, while he keeps to the Socratic dialogue, is admirable; but when he becomes rhetorical as in *the Menexenus*, or enthuſiaſtical as in *the Phaedrus*, he becomes much worſe than himſelf, to uſe an expreſſion of the Halicarnaſſian. His ſcholar Ariſtotle ſaid of his ſtile, as Diogenes Laertius reports, that is was neither verſe nor proſe. This I do not underſtand to relate to the words and phraſes, which, except in the ſingle dialogue of *the Phaedrus*, are all, as far as I am able to judge, ſufficiently proſaical, but to the numbers and rhythms which he ſtudied ſo much, as appears from the ſtory of his pocket-book, found about him when he died *; and for the purpoſe of pleaſing the ear in that way, he often uſes a very extraordinary arrangement of his words, of which I have given elſewhere an example †.

The next moſt famous dialogiſt of antiquity is Cicero: His manner in his philoſophical dialogues, is entirely different

* See Vol. ii. of this work, p. 567.

† Ibid. p. 569. in the note.

from Plato's. In the firſt place, his diſputations are not in the Socratic way of queſtion and anſwer, but in what may be called Orations, as in the treatiſe *De Natura Deorum*, *De Finibus*, and his *Academic Queſtions*, alſo his books *De Divinatione*, *De Fato*, *De Legibus*. But they ſo far reſemble Plato's dialogues, that the perſonages are real, and of different characters and opinions. They have alſo the circumſtances of time and place; and further I believe they are as much fiction as Plato's dialogues; at leaſt, with reſpect to the academic queſtions, he has expreſsly ſaid ſo. 2*do*, His five books of *Tuſculan Queſtions* cannot be ſaid to be dialogue at all, according to my definition of dialogue; for there are neither fable, character, or manners in them, only a converſation betwixt Cicero and a ſcholar whom he inſtructs, and who propoſes to him the queſtion about which he deſires to be ſatisfied. So that it reſembles more the manner of the ſophiſts, who at the Olympic games, or any other panegyrie of Greece, uſed to deſire any body to propoſe a ſubject to them, and they would give a diſcourſe up-

on it. And, *laſtly*, Plato never appears himſelf in any of his dialogues, whereas Cicero appears in all his, either in the beginning, the end, or through the whole.

I will ſpeak firſt of Cicero's philoſophical dialogues, (if the reader is pleaſed to give them that name), in which the manner is not only very different from that of Plato, but the ſtile; for it is of the rhetorical kind, and he profeſſes to adorn philoſophy with the flowers, or, as he calls them, the *lights* of eloquence. And indeed he practiſed ſpeaking ſo much, not only in real cauſes but in fictitious, (for he declamed even when he was old and had retired from buſineſs, during Caeſar's government,) that it is a wonder that any of his writings, even his familiar letters, are free of a taint of the declamatory ſtile, or that he could write in any other. His ſtile therefore is more copious than that of Plato, and much more ornamented: Nevertheleſs, it is not deficient in philoſophical accuracy; and he has interſperſed with it, here and there, the Stoical *ſpinoſum genus dicendi*, as he calls it, which makes not only a variety, but is a perfect contraſt to his

diffuſe rhetorical ſtile of philoſophy; for, if we may judge by the ſpecimens we have of it, it hardly deſerves the name of ſtile, any more than Euclid's Demonſtrations. In his philoſophical dialogues, there is a prodigious variety of argument upon every topic of philoſophy, which Cicero was well able to furniſh, having heard or converſed with all the famous philoſophers of his time, and read the works of thoſe who had gone before them, and he himſelf was of a ſect, which held that nothing was certain, but only one thing more probable than another*; therefore he liſtened to the arguments of all the ſects, and, in order to try the validity of their arguments, diſputed againſt them all. In ſhort, the dialogues of Cicero are moſt rich both in

* This ſect was called the *New Academy*, the philoſophers of which I think could not have been ſo good geometricians as thoſe of the *old*; nor indeed does it appear to me, that they could have learned the elements of geometry, and, at the ſame time, have maintained that there was no ſuch thing as certainty. And I ſhould ſuſpect that Cicero, who profeſſed himſelf of that ſect, had not ſtudied geometry; for it is, I think, impoſſible, that, where the ideas are ſo ſimple, and expreſſed by ſuch viſible ſigns, and where the definitions and diviſions are ſo clear, and the axioms, from whence the demonſtrations are deduced, ſo perfectly evident,

words and arguments; and, when to that we join the many examples from the Greek and Roman hiſtory, with which he ſupports and illuſtrates his arguments, I think we may pronounce them to be among the moſt entertaining and inſtructive works in the world, and which ought to be read by every man who would fill his mind with great ideas. His rhetorical ſtile in them too I like much better than that of his orations, becauſe there is more variety in it; for it is not ſo loaded with antitheſes, nor with that kind of rhythm, which is made by a number of words and phraſes, of like form and ſtructure, ſtrung together, very different from the true *Numerus Oratorius*, but which, no doubt, was applauded in the ſchools of declamation at Rome, though it would not have been tolerated in Athens *. Neither is the compoſition

there any man ſhould have a doubt that there was certainty, at leaſt in geometry. It was not therefore without reaſon, that Pythagoras laid the foundation of his philoſophy in geometry and arithmetic, as his ſcholars thereby got the idea of what ſcience and certainty was.—See what I have ſaid upon this ſubject, p. 7. of Preface to Vol. III. of *Antient Metaphyſics*.

* See Vol. III. of this work, p 81.—87.—90. where I have given ſundry examples of that kind of concinnity, or *prettineſs* as it may be called, in Cicero's ſtile.

ſo uniform by the periods and the ſeveral members of them almoſt always terminating in a verb, a fault to which all Latin compoſition is more or leſs liable, as I have elſewhere obſerved *.

But though I eſteem very much his philoſophical dialogues, I think his dialogues upon eloquence, and in general his writings upon that ſubject, the beſt part of his works: For to philoſophy he only applied, when he had nothing elſe to do, which was hardly ever the caſe before the civil wars. But the tribunals, the ſenate, and the forum, where he could ſhew his eloquence, were the occupations he delighted in. He had the beſt education as a ſpeaker, that the world could then afford; for he was taught both at home and abroad by the beſt maſters, and he conſtantly practiſed at the bar from his early youth: Nor did he for that interrupt the practice of declamation, to which he had been accuſtomed under his maſters, but declamed in public till he was praetor, and after he had gone through all the great offices of ſtate, when the ci-

* Page 95. and following of this Volume.

vil wars and the domination of Caeſar had put an end to his buſineſs in the forum and the ſenate, he continued ſtill the practice among his friends in his Tuſculan villa, where, as he tells us, he had two Gymnaſia. In the upper one, which he called Lyceum, (the name of the place where Ariſtotle taught), he practiſed his rhetorical exerciſes in the forenoon; and in the afternoon he deſcended to what he called his Academy, (the name of Plato's ſchool,) and there he held his philoſophical diſputations *. What he has written therefore upon philoſophy I conſider only as compilements from Greek books, and theſe not always the beſt, (for it is evident, that he had not ſtudied the philoſophical works of Ariſtotle †, who, he tells us, was

* Lib. i. cap. 5. De Divinat.—Tuſcul. Quaeſt. lib. iii. cap. 3.—Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 3.

† We need no other proof of this, than his ſaying ſomewhere that Ariſtotle believed the Deity to be material; the contrary of which muſt be well known to every man who has read the metaphyſics of Ariſtotle, which, it appears to me, that Cicero never ſtudied, nor any of his eſoteric works. He therefore aſcribes to Ariſtotle the opinion of the Stoics, who, no doubt,

at that time but little read and eſteemed in Rome), and he would no doubt ſet down what he remembered of the converſations he had had with Greek philoſophers then living. But as to eloquence, I believe there is in his writings every thing valuable that was to be found in any Greek book, and, over and above that, many excellent obſervations, which ſo long experience in ſo many cauſes public and private, and in ſo much buſineſs both in the ſenate and forum, muſt have ſuggeſted to a man of ſo much genius as Cicero. And beſides, in his rhetorical writings, we have a very complete hiſtory of eloquence, its beginning and progreſs both in Greece and Rome.

Of all that he has written upon the ſubject of rhetoric, there are only two pieces in the form of dialogue, namely, the three books *De Oratore*, and the ſingle book

believed that God was a material Being, and who appear to me to have been ſo little learned in metaphyſical philoſophy, and ſo vulgar in their notions, (however paradoxical they may have been in other things), as not to have had ſo much as the idea of an immaterial Being.

De Claris Oratoribus, the others being diſſertations, ſuch as the *Orator ad M. Brutum.* Of theſe two dialogues, the laſt mentioned is for the greater part, as the title bears, hiſtorical, giving an account of the Romans who before his time excelled in eloquence. But the other takes in the whole compaſs of the art; and, for the variety of the matter, the diverſity of the characters of the ſpeakers, the conduct of the piece, and the elegance of the compoſition, is, in my opinion, the fineſt thing Cicero has written; and I am not ſure, but it is the beſt of the dialogue kind that is extant.

The perſonages in this dialogue, are Lucius Craſſus, and Marcus Antonius, the two moſt famous orators at that time in Rome, and both conſular and cenſorian men; with them was Quintus Mucius Scaevola, a famous lawyer of thoſe days, whoſe houſe, like that of all the great lawyers, was an oracle in the city, reſorted to by men of the higheſt rank and dignity*. Neither was he unlearned in phi-

* Lib. i. *De Oratore*, cap. 45.

loſophy, and he was reckoned the moſt eloquent of all the lawyers. He was the oldeſt man of the company, and the father-in-law of Craſſus. Beſides theſe, there were two young men, Cotta and Sulpicius; from the firſt of whom Cicero is ſuppoſed to have got his information of what paſſed in the company. Cotta was a profeſſed admirer and follower of Craſſus; and both he and Sulpicius were very promiſing young men, and coming on very well in the art of ſpeaking; and Sulpicius is deſcribed by Craſſus, as having peculiar advantages of perſon, action, and voice *. Theſe were all the interlocutors of the firſt day. But, on the ſecond day, they were joined by an old man, Quintus Catulus, an orator too, but none of the moſt eminent, and Caius Julius Caeſar his brother, who excelled in one part of the art, namely pleaſantry and jeſt. As nothing ſhould happen by accident in a well conducted fable, Catulus informed Craſſus, who ſeemed to be a lit-

* Ibid. cap. 29.

tle ſurpriſed at their coming, that the evening before, when Caeſar was coming from his Tuſculanum to that of Catulus, he met upon the way Scaevola, who was coming from the Tuſculanum of Craſſus, and informed him of the learned converſation they had had that day, and how Craſſus had been prevailed upon to lecture upon eloquence, as if he had been in a Greek ſchool *.

The ſcene therefore of this dialogue is Craſſus's villa in the Tuſculanum; and the time was when a violent diſpute was going on between Philip the conſul, and Druſus the tribune of the people, who took a part very unuſual for a tribune, which was to defend the cauſe of the Patricians and of the ſenate againſt the conſul. During this diſpute, the *Ludi Romani* were celebrated, which making a vacation in buſineſs, Craſſus during that feſtivity, retired to his Tuſculanum, together with

* Ibid. lib. ii. cap. 3.

Marcus Antonius and Quintus Mucius Scaevola his father-in-law *.

As to the time of the endurance of the dialogue, it is not ſpun out to an immoderate length, as I have obſerved that Plato's two dialogues *De Republicâ et De Legibus* are, but is divided into two days. In the converſation of the firſt day, which makes the ſubject of Cicero's firſt book, Craſſus in order to incite the two young men, Cotta and Sulpicius, to proſecute their oratorial ſtudies, began a diſcourſe in praiſe of eloquence, which he extolled as the art not only of the greateſt dignity and ſplendor, but of the greateſt uſe, and alſo of the greateſt extent, comprehending in it all other arts and ſciences. This occaſioned a diſpute between him and Scaevola, who maintained that the art was neither of ſuch uſe nor ſuch extent, as Craſſus would make it to be. Craſſus anſwers his arguments, and mentions ſeveral arts which the orator ought to underſtand, particularly the ci-

* Lib. i. cap. 7.

vil law *, or the *ars boni et aequi*, as the doctors of law define it. In this diſpute, every one of the company takes a part more or leſs; for Cicero takes care that the dialogue ſhall never run into diſſertation: Particularly Antonius declared his opinion, that Craſſus meaſured the extent of the art by his own genius, not by its real bounds and limits, which confined it to the buſineſs of the forum †. Then, ſays Craſſus, as you have confined the art within ſuch narrow limits, you can the more eaſily deliver the precepts of it;—but to-morrow;—For as Scaevola has appointed to go to his villa this evening, and the heat of the day is now coming on, during which it will be proper for him to reſt, it is proper now to part.

In this ſecond day's converſation, Scaevola is not preſent; for he had gone the evening before to keep an appointment,

* Lib. i. cap. 36. et ſeq.

† Ibid. cap. 49.

as he ſaid, with Laelius in his own villa *, and did not return next day. Antonius, in the forenoon, proceeds to execute the part which Craſſus had aſſigned to him, and explains fully and diſtinctly all the matter of an oration, where he treats of the ſeveral *loci* or topics, from which the arguments are to be drawn in different cauſes; and ſhows how theſe arguments are to be diſpoſed and arranged; ſhows alſo, what is to be done in the ſeveral parts of an oration, ſuch as the prooemium, the narration, the confirmation, the refutation, and the peroration. Cicero here too, has avoided the appearance of diſſertation, or continued diſcourſe; for, though Antonius is the chief ſpeaker, the others break in very frequently, either aſking queſtions or making obſervations, and particularly Julius Caeſar entertains the company very agreeably upon a part of oratory, in which, as I have ſaid, he excelled, viz. in pleaſantry and facetiouſneſs. This ſubject he explains methodically, and illuſtrates by many exam-

* Lib. i. cap. 62.

ples, which, I believe, are a collection of almoſt all the witty ſayings of that age and the preceeding *.

The next converſation was in the afternoon of the ſame day, when, after having repoſed a little, according to their cuſtom, at mid-day, they met together in the middle of the wood, where it was cool and ſhady †, and there they ſat down; for their manner was to converſe walking in the forenoon, but ſitting in the afternoon. And then Craſſus began upon the ſubject which Antonius had aſſigned to him, viz. the manner of the orator, and the ornaments of diction, pronunciation, and action, with which the matter that Antonius had explained was to be clothed and dreſſed.

This is the ſubject of the third book, which Cicero begins with informing his brother Quintus Cicero, to whom the whole work is addreſſed, of the fate of Craſſus,

* Lib. ii. cap. 58. et ſequen.

† Lib. iii. cap. 5.

and of the other interlocutors in this day's debate. Craſſus, he ſays, died in a few days after, having over-heated himſelf by ſpeaking with great vehemence in the debate above mentioned, betwixt Philip the conſul and Druſus the tribune. While he was ſpeaking, he was ſeized, he ſays, with a pain in his ſide, and that ended in a fever, of which he died in a few days; a death, ſays Cicero, to be lamented by his friends, his country, and all good men: But, ſoon after, ſuch calamities befel the commonwealth, *ut mihi non erepta Lucio Craſſo a diis immortalibus vita, ſed donata mors eſſe, videatur.* Then he proceeds to relate how, in the contention betwixt Sylla and Marius, all the perſons who were preſent in that day's converſation, were either put to death or driven into exile. And, here we may obſerve, that by Cicero himſelf appearing in this work, by which, as I have obſerved, his dialogues are diſtinguiſhed from thoſe of Plato, this moſt beautiful and moving paſſage is introduced, which otherwiſe could not have been done with ſo much propriety.

Craſſus begins with obſerving, that Antonius, in dividing the taſk betwixt them two, had ſeparated two things, which in nature never can be ſeparated;—the things which are the ſubject of the oration, and the words. That, in ancient times, there was no ſuch ſeparation of the knowledge of things, from the art of words;—to think and act properly, and to ſpeak well, was one and the ſame ſcience, and that which Phoenix taught Achilles. The diviſion was firſt made in the ſchools of philoſophers, who reſerved to themſelves the knowledge of things, but aſſigned, to certain profeſſors they called Rhetoricians, the province of teaching words. But the two cannot be divided without great injury to both: For the knowledge of things cannot be uſeful, if they be not properly expreſſed in words; and nothing is more vain or inſignificant, than words without ſenſe or matter. The perfect orator, therefore, muſt join the knowledge of both: And he inſiſts, as he did in the preceeding day's converſation, that the orator ought to be learned in all arts and ſciences, that can be made the ſubject of public ſpeaking, and ſhould be like

Gorgias, who, at the olympic games, desired that any body would propose a subject to him, upon which he might speak, and who was so much honoured by the Greeks, that to him only they erected in Delphi a golden statue, whereas on others they only bestowed a gilt one *. And, particularly, he must be thoroughly learned in every thing concerning human life, laws, and government. Such, he says, were the ancient sages of Greece, and such were the great men in Rome before his time. But the perfect orator must be learned likewise in other things: He must have studied the philosophy of nature as well as of *man*; and must know something of those arts, which are useful and ageeeable in human life. And, as to the difficulty of acquiring such an universal knowledge, in a life so occupied as that of a Roman of high rank then was; he says, in the first place, that, unless you can learn such things quickly, you can never learn them well; and, there-

* Lib. iii. cap. 32.

fore, you ſhould not attempt to learn them at all: And, ſecondly, he makes a diſtinction betwixt thoſe who learn ſciences and arts for uſe, and thoſe who learn them for the pleaſure of the ſtudy, and therefore ſpend their whole lives in them *.

After this preamble, there was a ſhort pauſe in the converſation, which was interrupted by Cotta putting Craſſus in mind of the part he had undertaken, which was to explain to them the ornaments of ſpeech, and how the things treated of by the orator were to be expreſſed copiouſly, elegantly, and properly †. Upon this admonition, Craſſus proceeds to treat of tropes, and all the ornaments of ſingle words: Then he goes on to the compoſition of them; and there he inſiſts much upon numbers and rhythms, which he conſiders as eſſential to the ſtile of an orator. Of this, I have already ſpoken at pretty great length: And I ſhall only add here, that he obſerves what

* Ibid. cap. 23.

† Ibid. cap. 36.

is certainly true, that the rhythms, in the cadence or clauſule of the ſentence, affect the ear the moſt *. From thence he proceeds to ſpeak of what is decent, proper, and ſuitable to the ſubject; without which, there can be nothing excellent in eloquence, or any other art. Then he ſpeaks of action and pronunciation, and with that concludes. After he had done, Catulus makes him a compliment, in which he tells him, that he had explained all thoſe things ſo well, that he ſeemed to be able to teach them to the Greeks, not to have learned them from the Greeks: And he adds, that he rejoices to have been preſent himſelf at ſuch a diſcourſe, but wiſhes that his ſon-in-law Hortenſius had been preſent likewiſe. Upon this occaſion, Cicero makes a compliment from the mouth of Craſſus to his friend, though rival in eloquence, Hortenſius; and ſo the dialogue ends.

It is to be obſerved, that Craſſus, in this part of the dialogue, ſpeaks more in continued diſcourſe, than any other of the

* Ibid. cap. 50.

interlocutors. Antonius, who had ſpoken ſo much in the preceding part of the day, hardly ſays any thing. The young men, Caeſar and Sulpicius, only expreſs their admiration of Craſſus; and it is only the elderly man Catulus, who takes occaſion now and then to ſpeak at ſome length. Every thing, therefore, in this laſt converſation, as well as in the preceding, appears to be conducted with the greateſt propriety and decorum.

As Craſſus expreſſes Cicero's own idea of a perfect orator, we may obſerve, that his part is much more laboured than that of any other of the ſpeakers. And, beſides what he makes him ſay of eloquence, he throws in to his diſcourſe a great deal of very good philoſophy, particularly where he makes him ſay, ſpeaking of the neceſſary union betwixt words and things, that all things in nature are one; that there is a bond of union, by which every thing is connected with every thing, ſo that nothing can be ſeparated from the whole, and exiſt entirely by itſelf*.

* Ibid. cap. 5. and 6.

So that here Cicero ſhows to be true, what he ſays elſewhere, that he was formed an orator, not in the ſhops of Rhetoricians, but in the walks of the Academy. The ſtile too I admire very much, for it is exceedingly copious, yet not ſuperabundant, as it often is in his orations; nor does he dwell ſo long upon the ſame form and figure of ſpeech, as he frequently does in theſe.

As to Craſſus's idea of an orator, I believe moſt people will be inclined to the opinion of Antonius, who would confine him to the buſineſs of the bar, the forum, or the ſenate; and not oblige him to take ſuch a range through all the arts and ſciences as Craſſus thinks neceſſary. But, in the firſt place, we are to conſider, that Craſſus is ſpeaking of the ornaments of diction. Now, I maintain, that to make a ſtile of ſpeaking both copious and ornamented, the knowledge of very many things is abſolutely neceſſary; and that no man can ſpeak in ſuch a ſtile, whoſe ſtudies are confined to one particular thing, though it be ſuppoſed to be the very thing upon

which he ſpeaks, and though his knowledge of it be as perfect as poſſible. I ſay as perfect as poſſible; for I hold it to be true, what Craſſus ſays, that there is ſuch a connection and *conſent*, as he calls it, of all things in this univerſe, that no man who underſtands only one thing, can underſtand it perfectly. And, *ſecundo*, I ſay, that a man whoſe knowledge is ſo confined, cannot have that elevation of mind, which a great ſpeaker ought to have; he cannot thunder and lighten, and aſtoniſh all Greece, as Pericles did; nor could Pericles have done that, if he had not heard Anaxagoras the philoſopher.

Upon the whole, therefore, I do not heſitate to pronounce, that thoſe three books *De Oratore*, are not only the completeſt work of the dialogue kind which he has executed, but the fineſt of all his works.

Beſides theſe dialogues upon philoſophy and eloquence, there is a work of Cicero's, which he entitles *Cato Major, ſeu De Senectute*. It is not a dialogue, but a continued diſcrouſe, made by Cato the elder,

at the deſire of Scipio and Laelius; and, beſides, there is neither time nor place, nor any thing like a fable. It is, nevertheleſs, the pleaſanteſt little work I ever read, and I don't wonder that Cicero had ſuch delight in writing it, that it not only, as he ſays, made him forget the infirmities of old age, but made that time of life pleaſant to him. Philoſophy therefore, he adds, never can be ſufficiently praiſed, which makes every time of life agreeable*. There is in it a great deal of Greek learning, as well as of Roman: For, as he tells us in his introduction, Cato in his old age became ſtudious of Greek learning. The ſtile is very elegant, but not near ſo much raiſed as the ſtile of Craſſus upon the ſubject of oratory: Nor indeed was it proper that it ſhould have been ſo. Theodorus Gaza, one of the great reſtorers of Greek learning in Italy †, was ſo charmed with it, that he has done it an honour,

* In initio.

† See what I have ſaid of him, in the preface to the III. Volume of Metaphyſics, p. 71.

which, I believe, he never did to any Latin book, that of tranſlating it into Greek, though he underſtood the Latin very well, as appears not only from this tranſlation, but from other tranſlations, he was employed by the Popes to make, of Greek authors into Latin *. In reading it, I was at the pains to compare it with the original, paragraph by paragraph; and this led me to obſerve, what I have mentioned before, the great advantage the Greek has over the Latin, by the uſe of ſo many connecting particles, giving a roundneſs and a flow to the Greek compoſition, which even the language of Cicero has not.

There is another very fine treatiſe of Cicero's, and which comes nearer to dia-

* This tranſlation of Theodorus is a very rare book. I never ſo much as heard of it, till I was favoured with the uſe of a copy of it, and the only copy, for any thing that I know, that is in Britain, by My Lord Stormont, who is an excellent ſcholar, and very curious about every thing relating to Greek learning. He did not, like many of our travellers now-a-days, drop his claſſical learning in his travels, but carried it with him all over Europe, and continued the ſtudy of it even in the courts where he reſided, and where he was employed in public buſineſs.

logue than the one laſt mentioned. It is entitled *Laelius, ſive de Amicitia;* for there is there a Story, with the circumſtances of Perſons, Time, and Place. It is a converſation, which Scaevola the augur and Caius Fannius had with Laelius, the friend of Publius Scipio, a few days after the death of Scipio. Which converſation, Cicero ſays, Scaevola, ſitting upon a ſemicircular bench in his houſe, related to him when he was very young, and to ſome other of his intimates. But it is a continued diſcourſe of Laelius, with little or no interruption, and no diverſity of ſentiments. But, though no dialogue, it is very inſtructive, as well as pleaſant, having a great deal of good philoſophy in it, and much knowledge of human life, and of men and manners.

I will conclude what I have to ſay of Cicero's dialogues, with two or three obſervations. My firſt obſervation is, that I think Cicero has choſen very well the perſonages whom he introduces ſpeaking. They are all men of eminence in the ſtate,

either then living or dead; and, though dead, the Romans had ſuch a juſt veneration for their anceſtors, that they would hear, with the greateſt pleaſure, ſuch men as Scipio, Laelius, and Cato ſpeaking: And, I think, it is true what Cicero ſays, that ſuch illuſtrious men gave more gravity and dignity to what was ſaid, than it could otherwiſe have had. And he adds, 'ſ *Ipſe, mea legens, ſic afficior interdum, ut* 'ſ *Catonem, non me, loqui exiſtimem* *.' This appears to me to be a great advantage, which Cicero in his dialogues has over Plato; for, unleſs it be Socrates and Alcibiades, there is hardly any perſon of eminence who ſpeaks in his dialogues. The reſt are all burghers of Athens, of whom we know nothing, itinerant ſophiſts, ſuch as Gorgias and Protagoras, or nameleſs ſtrangers.

My other obſervation is, that there is a politeneſs in Cicero's dialogues, which I do not find in thoſe of Plato; for the iro-

* *Laelius* in initio.

nical manner of Socrates, though it muſt have been very pleaſant to the by-ſtanders, could not have been agreeable to thoſe with whom he converſed, as the tendency of it was to ſhow their vanity and ignorance, or, in other words, to make fools of them; whereas in Cicero the perſonages treat one another with the greateſt reſpect, however much they may differ in opinion. Craſſus, in the laſt book *De Oratore*, finds fault with ſome things in the manner of ſpeaking both of Cotta and Sulpicius; but does it in ſo gentle and ſo friendly a manner, that they both think themſelves obliged to him for his obſervation. The praiſes they beſtow upon one another ſeem to be all ſincere and to proceed from the heart, without the leaſt appearance of flattery or ſervility: And of themſelves they ſpeak with the moſt becoming modeſty. In ſhort, I do not know that there is any where to be found a better ſchool for politeneſs, than the dialogues of Cicero.

Another thing which pleaſes me very much in Cicero's writings upon eloquence and philoſophy is, that they are almoſt all

of them inſcribed to ſome friend, ſuch as Brutus, Pomponius Atticus, Varro; and his beſt work, as I think, of the dialogue kind, the three books *De Oratore*, is dedicated to his brother. To all theſe works there are prefaces in which he converſes with theſe friends in the moſt friendly manner; and which convinces me, that he had really a heart capable of friendſhip, the greateſt gift that I think God and nature could have beſtowed upon him, eſpecially in the times in which he lived, the miſeries of which, he ſays himſelf, he could not have ſupported without philoſophy and friendſhip. And I would have thoſe, who live in the preſent times, conſider, whether it be poſſible to live a happy life without the aid of philoſophy, and the ſociety and friendſhip of men of worth and knowledge, ſuch as thoſe with whom Cicero lived.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Lord Shafteſbury's dialogue, entitled The Moraliſts; *—this a compleat dramatical piece in all its parts; —better divided as to time, than ſome dialogues of Plato.—Of the different characters in it.—The firſt day's converſation a proper introduction to what is principal in the piece, viz. the converſion of a ſceptic to theiſm.—The ſecond day's converſation is divided into four parts:—The firſt is of Philocles with Theocles in the morning, alone;—The ſecond at dinner, when two new characters are introduced;—The third is in the fields, when Theocles, in a long diſcourſe, demonſtrates the exiſtence of God from his works.—Here the cataſtrophe of the piece begins.—The ſequel of this converſation contains conſequences from what had been before demonſtrated.—The fourth converſation of the ſecond day is upon the ſubject of mira-*

cles and prodigies.—This converſation agreeably varied with reſpect to the ſpeakers as well as the ſubject.—Of the third day's converſation of Philocles with Theocles alone.—The ſcene the ſame as where they met the firſt day.—Of the Rhapſodies of Theocles in this converſation, and the ſtile of them;—not incredible to thoſe who have heard the Italian rhapſodiſts.—Subject of the firſt *rhapſody is an invocation of* Divinity;—*of the* ſecond, *a deſcription of that vivifying power, which pervades all nature:—The* third *has for its ſubject the elements and minerals:—The* fourth *contains a deſcription of the different countries of the earth, and the various appearances of nature in them.—Betwixt ſome of the rhapſodies, a great deal of cool reaſoning and dialogue in the Socratic way of queſtion and anſwer is interſperſed.—Concluſion of the work ſuitable to the main deſign of it;—contains,* 1mo, *An account of Beauty, and the ſeveral kinds of it;—ſhows that all beauty is reſolvable into the Supreme Beauty of the firſt Being.—Beauty produces admiration, and Admiration enthuſiaſm.—Of the ſeve-*

ral kinds of enthuſiaſm.—The ſenſe of beauty ſhown to be innate in man, and not acquired.—2do, The concluſion alſo ſhows the neceſſity of philoſophiſing; and that, in fact, every man does philoſophiſe more or leſs. —Obſervations upon this dialogue:—The fable of it excellent, with greater variety than in Cicero's dialogue De Oratore: *—The ſtile ſuch as might be expected from a man like Lord Shafteſbury:—Politeneſs too, ſuch as in Cicero's dialogues. —Obſervations on the philoſophy of this piece.—The love, of which beauty is the object, made a fundamental principle both of virtue and religion.—This philoſophy perfectly agreeable to Scripture.— From the ſame principle, Shafteſbury demonſtrates the Being and Attributes of God.—This demonſtration better than any demonſtration of the ſame* a priori.—*Dr Clarke's demonſtration examined, and ſhown not to be ſo compleat as that of Shafteſbury.—Shafteſbury's philoſophy, however, not perfect in this dialogue.— The diſtinction betwixt the animal and intellectual parts of our nature, not explicitly laid down.—The conſequences of*

this diſtinction;—it demonſtrates the beautiful to be good;—puts an end to the paradox of the Stoics concerning virtue;—their language more proper than that of the other philoſophers.—Praiſe of Lord Shafteſbury's writings.—They are now out of faſhion.—That the fate of other writings, which deſerve it as little.—Of Mr Harris's dialogues upon art *and* happineſs,—*not properly* dialogues, *according to my definition.—They have, however, great merit, as all the writings of that author have.*

THE fineſt dialogue of modern times, ſo fine, that I think it may be compared with any thing of the kind we have got from antiquity, is My Lord Safteſbury's rhapſody, entitled *The Moraliſts.* It has every thing which a dialogue requires; for it has a fable, characters, manners, incidents, and ſcenery too, and in ſhort, every thing belonging to a dramatic piece. The ſubject of it is the converſion of a ſceptic to theiſm. This converſion is made by

a philoſopher, who is poſſeſſed of the nobleſt of all paſſions, an enthuſiaſtical admiration of God and Nature. So here are two very different characters diſtinctly marked: And in the courſe of the action, which laſts three days, there are other characters introduced; for my Lord has not fallen into the error, which, I think, Plato has committed, of making but one converſation of his ten books of Polity, and likewiſe only one of his thirteen books of Laws, and ſo drawing out each of theſe dialogues to an immeaſurable length, an error, which, as I have obſerved, Cicero has alſo avoided. In the firſt day's converſation, Philocles (ſo the ſceptic is called, who is the narrator of the dialogue), recites a converſation which paſſed betwixt him and his friend Palemon, in the park at London, upon the ſubject of the miſeries of human life, in which Philocles having thown out ſome things of the ſceptical kind that gave offence to Palemon, as tending to ſhow, that there is no diſtinction of right and wrong in actions, any more than of truth and falſehood in

arguments,—Philocles, uſing the privilege, as he ſays, of a ſceptic, entertained him with a diſcourſe of ſome length upon the order and beauty which appears in nature, the government of the univerſal mind, which we ought from thence to infer, and to conclude, that all thoſe ills natural and moral, of which they had been ſpeaking, were no more than ills in appearance, being only the neceſſary conſequences of the univerſe being a ſyſtem. This ſudden change having ſurpriſed Palemon, he aſked Philocles what had produced ſentiments ſo different from thoſe he had before expreſſed. In anſwer to this, Philocles informs him, that ſome days ago he had had a converſation with a friend in the country, whom he calls Theocles, who had made a perfect convert of him to the firm belief of theiſm, and the government of an univerſal mind of infinite goodneſs and wiſdom. This converſation Palemon earneſtly deſired to hear; but, as it was then growing late, Philocles could not ſatisfy him at that time, but promiſed that he would become author for his ſake, and ſet it down in writing.

This is the firſt day's converſation, and I think a very natural and proper introduction to what is principal in the piece, viz. the converſations with Theocles, which make the ſubject of the two other days. The ſcene of theſe is Theocles's country ſeat, where Philocles had gone upon a viſit to him. There he finds him in the forenoon, walking in the fields with a Virgil in his hand. This rural ſcene is very well deſcribed *. Here, after ſome diſcourſe, which the company, that Theocles had with him, naturally gave occaſion to, the converſation took a philoſophical turn; and they began to talk of pleaſure and happineſs, and of what was good or ill in human life. Upon this ſubject they at laſt agreed, that, what made perfect happineſs, was the love and admiration of what was perfectly beautiful and good. Such an object, Theocles ſaid, was to be found in the univerſe, and which he promiſed to diſcover to him the next morning; for, by this time, a ſervant had come from the houſe

* Part ii. ſect. i.

to let Theocles know, that company was come to dine with him.

And here we have an epiſode very naturally introduced, in which we have two new characters that give an agreeable variety to the piece, and furniſh matter for converſation on different ſubjects, but all having a relation to the principal ſubject of the piece. One of theſe characters is an old gentleman, a religious bigot, and a man not at all of pleaſant manners: The other is a modeſt young gentleman, and more agreeable in converſation.

The dinner was ſuch, as to give occaſion to Theocles to ſpeak in praiſe of the virtue of temperance; from which it appears to have been a dinner very different from what is now given by men of faſhion. From temperance in eating and drinking, they came to ſpeak of temperance with reſpect to wealth and honours, and of virtue in general. Upon this ſubject it was obſerved, that to exalt virtue and its happineſs, was underſtood by ſome religious men to be depreſſing and undervaluing religion: For

virtue, they ſaid, was miſery; and that there was no happineſs in this life, nor any except what religion promiſed in our future ſtate. By arguing in this way, Theocles obſerved it was impoſſible to convince an atheiſt, who, if he believed that there was ſo much diſorder in the preſent ſtate of things, would not be diſpoſed to think better of the future, and never could be perſuaded, that the world was under the government of a Wiſe and Good Being. This naturally led the converſation to ſpeak of atheiſm, and of the common way of arguing againſt atheiſts; when it was obſerved, that if an author argued calmly againſt atheiſts, and ſtated the arguments fully and fairly, he was underſtood to be a friend to them. This, it was ſaid, was the caſe of the learned and pious Dr Cudworth: And the ſame objection was made to a late author, viz. the author of the '*Inquiry concerning Virtue*.' And here Lord Shaftesbury introduces, I think not improperly, a defence of his own work from the mouth of Theocles, who ſpeaks of that author as his friend, and therefore very willingly undertakes his defence in a pret-

ty long diſcourſe, where he ſhows, that the only way to convince an atheiſt, is to treat him with good manners, and with calmneſs and moderation. That ſolidly to refute the arguments of the atheiſts, and to eſtabliſh upon ſound principles the exiſtence of a Deity, muſt neceſſarily be previous to our belief in any revelation from that Deity. That genuine theiſm and juſt notions of the Divinity muſt neceſſarily produce that divine love, which is acknowledged to be the perfection of religion, ariſing from the high idea we have of the Being which is the object of it. This, he ſays, was what his friend recommended, maintaining that we were not truly religious, unleſs our devotion proceeded from ſuch a principle, and not from the hopes of reward, or the fears of puniſhment; though ſuch motives might be very properly uſed, with thoſe who were by nature incapable of ſo liberal a devotion. This, ſays Theocles, I think is ſufficient to defend the morality of my friend's Inquiry, and ſhew, that it is nowiſe inconſiſtent with religion, but quite the contrary. At the ſame time, as his work is entirely con-

fined to morality, he has not proved that a Being exiſts worthy of that diſintereſted love and admiration, in which he makes the perfection of religion to conſiſt: To ſupply this defect, ſays he, I muſt become preacher, and give you a ſyſtem of theology agreeable to his principles *.

Here this converſation ended, by the coming in of ſome viſitants, who took up

* Part ii. ſect. 3. *in fine.*—I conſider therefore the Rhapſody as a ſequel or appendix to the Inquiry, exalting morality to theology, which ought to be conſidered, and is conſidered by our author, as the ſummit of human virtue and human knowledge. I have elſewhere ſaid, that the *Inquiry* is the beſt book in Engliſh upon the ſubject of morals: And I am not at all diſpoſed to retract that opinion, but, on the contrary, after having read it over again, on occaſion of this commentary, which I have given upon the *Rhapſody*, I am fully convinced, that it is the beſt demonſtration to be found in any book that I know, antient or modern, of that moſt important truth, the foundation, I think, of theiſm, That virtue is the greateſt happineſs, and vice the greateſt miſery of men; for we cannot otherwiſe be convinced ourſelves, nor convince others, that the world is under the Government of Supreme Intelligence, Power, and Goodneſs.

the remaining part of the afternoon in other diſcourſe. In the evening, the ſcene is changed from the houſe to the fields, and all the reſt of the company being gone, Philocles, with the old gentleman and his young friend who remained, inſiſted with Theocles, that he ſhould give them the ſermon he had mentioned, which accordingly he did, taking occaſion to begin it from obſervations made by Philocles upon the ſtructure and organization of the plants they ſaw in the fields.

And here begins what may be called the cataſtrophe or *denoument* of the piece, to which every thing preceding has a tendency more or leſs; I mean the demonſtration of the exiſtence of a Sovereign Mind and Supreme Intelligence, given by Theocles in language as beautiful and as much ornamented as ſcience can be delivered in. Nor does Philocles forget his character of ſceptic, and the part aſſigned to him of objecting to the arguments of Theocles, which part he acts exceedingly well; and thus the argument is fully laid before us, and according to the fair me-

thod in which even atheiſm, as Theocles thinks, ſhould be treated, every thing is ſaid in its behalf that can be ſaid, but to which Theocles gives a ſufficient anſwer. In this debate the old gentleman takes a part ſuitable to his character, anſwering or endeavouring to anſwer the objections of Philocles, but in an angry paſſionate way: Whereas the anſwers of Theocles are perfectly mild and good humoured; for he is a moſt amiable enthuſiaſt, without any mixture of that paſſion, violence, and furious zeal, which we often ſee in religious enthuſiaſts.

What follows after this is to be conſidered as corollaries or conſequences of Theocles's demonſtration; tending at the ſame time to ſtrengthen it, by ſhewing that his theory is agreeable to fact and obſervation. The laſt converſation of this ſecond day is after ſupper, and the ſubject of it is prodigies, miracles, apparitions, and other things altogether out of the ordinary courſe of nature. By theſe the old gentleman would prove the exiſtence of a Deity; but Philo-

cles, taking up the argument of Theocles, ſhews that it is only from order, regularity, and uniformity in the operations of Nature, that we can infer the exiſtence of a Supreme Intelligence; but from ſuch violation of the laws of Nature, as thoſe mentioned by the old gentleman, and the confuſion in the ſyſtem thence reſulting, nothing could be inferred except either the chaos and atoms of the atheiſts, or the magic and demons of the polytheiſts. This converſation is agreeably varied and diſtinguiſhed from the preceding converſations of the ſame day, not only by the ſubject, but by Theocles, who was the chief ſpeaker in thoſe, ſaying nothing in this, and likewiſe by the modeſt young gentleman, who had been only a hearer before, now taking a very proper part in the converſation, and joining Philocles to the great offence of the old gentleman, who gave him a rebuke in ſuch rough terms, that Philocles interpoſed, and finiſhed the argument, which the young gentleman had ſo well begun, but his modeſty would not allow him to finiſh.—And thus ends the ſecond day.

The third and laſt day begins with Theocles diſmiſſing his two gueſts early in the morning, (ſuch was the cuſtom in thoſe days) and going out to his morning walk in the fields, where Philocles finds him. It is the ſame beautiful rural ſcene, where theſe two met the preceding morning. Here Theocles, at the deſire of Philocles, addreſſed that Univerſal Mind in a ſtrain very different from that in which he had proved the exiſtence of ſuch a Mind. Before he reaſoned as a philoſopher, now he ſpeaks as one inſpired, not by the demon which inſpired the Delphic prieſteſs or the Sybil of Virgil, but by Divine Love, which is mild, gentle, and humane. There is nothing therefore in Theocles of the *os rabidum*, or the *fera corda*, though his language be ſo much elevated, that it may be ſaid to be *nill mortale ſonans*. It is of that kind which the antients called dithyrambic, but much leſs obſcure than the dithyrambics of Pindar, nor indeed is it at all obſcure. It has thoſe *looſe numbers*, of which, as we have ſeen, the antients ſpeak ſo much *, as much as our

* Page 261. et ſeq.

language will admit; and the only fault I find with it is, that the numbers are ſometimes too much aſtricted and altogether verſe, though that happens but very rarely. But, upon the whole, I think it the moſt ſplendid language we have in proſe, and the fineſt ſtile of the kind in Engliſh, but abſolutely unfit for any other purpoſe, except for that for which the author has employed it.

There are, I know, who, now that inſpiration has ceaſed, will think ſuch extatic effuſions altogether unnatural. But thoſe men know not the powers of human nature, and judge of other men by themſelves. Even now the *Improviſatoris* and *Improviſatrices* of Italy will pour forth extempore, upon any ſubject aſſigned to them, a great many of their *octavo rimo* verſes, of more difficult compoſition than any verſe we now uſe in Engliſh, and much more difficult than the meaſured proſe of Theocles *. And I have no doubt, but

* Of old there were ſuch Improviſatoris. Cicero mentions one of them, viz. Archias the Poet, who,

one of theſe, if he was as great a philoſopher as Theocles, could make verſes extempore upon the ſame ſubjects.

The firſt Rhapſody of Theocles, is an invocation in very ſublime language, but without any thing like what we call Fuſtian or Bombaſt, of that Sovereign Mind, the exiſtence of which he had proved, praying for aſſiſtance to enable him to trace, in the works of creation, the marks of Wiſdom, Goodneſs, and Power.

In the ſecond Rhapſody (or rant, as thoſe who are not initiated into this Sublime Philoſophy, would call it,) he, in a ſtill higher ſtrain, goes through the works of nature, obſerving how the vital principle, diffuſed through the whole, operates in ſo many different ways, producing ſtill new forms out of the ruins of the old, ſo that,

he ſays, could pour forth extempore a number of excellent verſes, upon any ſubject that happened then to be agitated; (*Pro Archia poeta*,) cap. 8. and the *admirabilis* Crichtonus, as he was called, could, it is ſaid, have done the ſame.

amidſt the greateſt ſeeming profuſion, nothing is loſt. Here a great deal is ſaid of matter and of mind, and of thoſe two entities ſo difficult to be apprehended, Time and Motion. Then he proceeds in the ſame rapturous ſtrain to ſurvey the heavens, deſcribing the ſun, the planets, and the fixed ſtars, in language equal, if poſſible, to the ſubject.

The ſubject of the third Rhapſody, is this our earth; where, in deſcribing the minerals and the four elements, and particularly fire diffuſed, as he ſays, through the whole globe, and animating every thing in it, he ſhows more of natural knowledge than I thought he had been poſſeſſed of.

In his fourth and laſt *tranſport*, he ſurveys the ſurface of this our globe, going through every climate and every country of it, where there is any thing very remarkable, and deſcribing with great accuracy, as well as great pomp of language, all the wonderful ſcenes which it preſents to us.

Betwixt theſe ſallies there is interjected a great deal of cloſe reaſoning by way of queſtion and anſwer in the Socratic manner, which was very proper in a converſation betwixt them two, but would, I think, not have been ſo proper in the mixt company they were in before. The tendency of this reaſoning, is to ſtrengthen ſtill farther, the proof of the exiſtence of a Mind in nature, which unites the whole, and makes *one* of the univerſe. For proof of this, he appeals to every plant and every animal, in every one of which it is evident, that there is ſome one thing, which makes *a whole* of each of them. And, as every thing in nature is connected, as well as the parts of a plant or animal, for the ſame reaſon, there muſt be ſomething in nature which makes a whole of it. In this interlude, as it may be called, there is a moſt ſatisfactory anſwer given to an objection made before by Philocles, but which had not been anſwered, namely, that tho' there may be union, order, and regularity, in ſo much of the ſyſtem of the univerſe as we ſee, yet all might be diſorder and confuſion in the reſt of the univerſe, which

is infinite with reſpect to the ſmall part of it that we can diſcover; for, if it were ſo, ſays Theocles, the infinite muſt prevail over the finite, and all be diſorder and confuſion.

Betwixt the ſecond and third Rhapſodies there is nothing interpoſed, but an interruption which Theocles makes to himſelf, ſuppoſing that Philocles had ſomething to object to what he had ſaid; but Philocles ſaying that he had nothing to object, he proceeded to deſcant, as I have ſaid, upon the elements and minerals.

Betwixt the third and fourth there is alſo nothing interpoſed except an admonition of Philocles, that he would not inſiſt ſo much upon the power of the element of fire, which, though ſo friendly to life, Theocles had ſaid, might, when let looſe, deſtroy every thing, and bring on an univerſal conflagration. But, ſays he, deſcribe to me the maſs of nature as it appears upon this our earth; and accordingly Theocles proceeds to give that beautiful map of the earth above mentioned.

The concluſion of the work is very proper and ſuitable to the main deſign. The ſubject of this concluſion is, 1*mo*, Beauty, and the different kinds of it: 2*do*, The neceſſity of philoſophizing in order to be happy. As to Beauty, he ſhows, that it is eſſential both to virtue and religion; for beauty is the object of love, and we love no perſon, no action, no thing, in which we do not perceive beauty. Now, there can be no virtue without the love of virtue, nor any religion without the love of God. We muſt therefore perceive beauty both in God and in Virtue. Then he proceeds to ſhew, that body has in itſelf no beauty, but that the beauty we admire in it is all from mind: So that what we admire in the works of art is the genius of the artiſt; and the beauty in the works of nature, where elſe can it be, but in the Mind of the Sovereign Artiſt, who therefore is the fountain of all Beauty, whether of body or of mind, as well as of all Intelligence. As there can be no love without admiration, and as admiration to a great degree is enthuſiaſm, he from thence derives the enthuſiaſms of poets, painters, muſicians, and the nobler enthuſiaſm ſtill

of the truly virtuous man *, and the nobleſt of all enthuſiaſms, that ariſing from the love and admiration of the Supreme Beauty.

He next proceeds to ſhow, that the ſenſe of the *fair* and the *beautiful*, the *pulchrum* and *honeſtum*, the *graceful* and the *becoming*, not only in outward forms, but in ſentiments and actions, is in man from nature, not from art or teaching, inſtitution or habit. This is ſo clear a propoſition, that I wonder it ſhould be denied, or even doubted of by any: And yet I am told, that in a book lately publiſhed upon the ſubject of morality, it is at leaſt doubted of, if not denied. I think the author might

* See what I have collected from the Pythagorean philoſophers upon the ſubject of the enthuſiaſm of virtue, in the preface to vol. iii. of Antient Metaphyſics p. 33 and 34. to which may be added what Ariſtotle ſays, (*Magna Moralia*, lib. ii. cap. 7. verſus finem) That the ὁρμη προς το καλον, is more the principle of virtue than λογος, or *reaſon*; for, ſays he, in the practice of virtue, the ὁρμη muſt begin and carry on the practice, while reaſon only directs and approves; it is therefore the leading principle.

have as well doubted whether ſuch a thing as virtue or religion exiſted; or indeed whether ſuch an animal as man exiſted: For I hold that there is nothing, which more eminently diſtinguiſhes the man from the brute, than the ſenſe of the fair and the beautiful.

The other thing he mentions in the concluſion of the dialogue, namely, the utility of philoſophy, does alſo belong to the ſubject; for it was very proper, after having philoſophized ſo much, to ſhow that it was not to no purpoſe, but on the contrary, of the higheſt uſe. This he proves, not by a continued diſcourſe, as he proves other things, but by cloſe pungent interrogations and anſwers, which, at the ſame time that they are moſt convincing, make a beautiful variety in the ſtile: And he concludes the whole by ſhowing, that, in fact, all men do philoſophize right or wrong; for they deliberate about what is uſeful or hurtful, what contributes to their happineſs or not; and, even if they ſhould determine not to deliberate at all, but to follow every fancy or conceit that is up-

permoſt, ſtill that will be in ſome ſort to philoſophize.

Thus I have analyzed this moſt beautiful piece; ſo beautiful in its ſtile and compoſition, that it ſhews the author well qualified to write upon the Beautiful, which indeed is the chief ſubject of the piece. I will conclude with ſome general obſervations upon it.

And, in the firſt place, as the principal thing, according to Ariſtotle, in every dramatical piece, ſuch as I hold this to be, is the fable, that principal part in the Moraliſts is, I think, admirable: For, at the ſame time that there is a perfect unity in it, there is a greater variety of characters and incidents, than in any dialogue of Plato, and more than even in Cicero's dialogue *De Oratore*, where the two days are not near ſo well filled up as the three days of the Moraliſts; and there are ſeveral changes of the ſcene, beſides the introduction of new perſonages, which I think are very agreeable. It is therefore a fable of the kind which Ariſtotle calls complex; and

which, if the unity of the action is preſerved, he prefers to the ſimple.

The ſtile is ſuch as might be expected from a thorough well bred gentleman, well acquainted with life and manners, at the ſame time an accompliſhed ſcholar, and who in his travels had acquired a very high taſte for the fine arts, as appears from many paſſages of his writings. The ſtile of ſuch a writer muſt needs be copious and rich in all the ornaments which the knowledge of mythology, antient hiſtory, and the fine arts can furniſh. His ſtile is too luxuriant, as I have obſerved elſewhere *, in ſome other of his writings; but I think it is chaſte and ſober enough in this piece. The ſtile of the rhapſodies of Theocles, is, as I have obſerved, very uncommon, excellent however of the kind, but very different, as it ought to be, from that of the dialogue, which is eaſy and natural, and a very good imitation of the converſation of gentlemen upon learned

* Vol. iii. p. 284.—and p. 206. and 207. of this volume.

ſubjects: And it has that politeneſs, which I have commended ſo much in Cicero's dialogue, particularly in what is ſaid by the two principal perſonages Theocles and Philocles, and which has a contraſt in Shafteſbury, that is not to be found in Cicero; I mean the roughneſs and ill-breeding of the old gentleman.

As to the philoſophy of this work, tho' it do not belong to the ſubject of this volume, I cannot help making ſome obſervations upon it. It is plainly a ſupplement, as the author has told us, to the *Inquiry concerning Virtue*; and he has in it carried the philoſophy of morals to theology, and, I think, the moſt ſublime theology that is to be found in Engliſh: And he has very properly connected the doctrine of morals, that is, the knowledge of ourſelves, with theology; for, as I have obſerved elſewhere*, we can know nothing of Divinity, without firſt knowing ourſelves. He has therefore founded morality and

* Antient Metaphyſics, vol. iii. p. 5.

theology upon the ſame principle, namely, that the beautiful and good are one and the ſame thing; and that what is beautiful and good in the characters of men, is beautiful and good, but in an infinitely higher degree, in the Divinity. This propoſition therefore, that the beautiful and the good are the ſame, and which is a fundamental propoſition in this treatiſe, I hold to be the baſis both of morality and theology, though it be not ſo laid down in any treatiſe of morality in modern times, nor explicitly in any antient work, as far as I know, upon that ſubject.

And, as beauty is the object of love, without which, as I have obſerved, love cannot be conceived, I find a wonderful agreement betwixt the philoſophy of my Lord Shafteſbury upon this ſubject and the doctrine of our holy religion. The firſt and fundamental precept of the law, as our Saviour tells us *, was 'to love the 'Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with 'all thy ſoul, and with all thy ſtrength,

* Luke, chap. x. v. 27.

'and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour 'as thyſelf.'—Again, our Saviour ſays to his Diſciples, 'a new commandment I 'give unto you, that ye love one another; 'as I loved you, that ye alſo love another.' —'By this ſhall all men know, that ye 'are my Diſciples, if ye have love one to 'another*.' And St Paul, in that remarkable paſſage in II. Corinthians chap. 13. where he commends love, makes it the eſſential duty of every Chriſtian, without which nothing that he can do, neither propheſying, underſtanding myſteries, nor working miracles, nor even martyrdom, will ſignify any thing †.

* St John's Goſpel, chap. xiii. v. 34. and 35. See alſo the ſame goſpel, chap. xv. v. 12.

† St Paul beſtows this whole chapter upon the praiſe of charity: It is written in a ſtile, which has more of the rhetorical caſt than any thing that I remember to have read in Scripture. The word, which we tranſlate *charity*, is αγαπη or *love*; for that it is not giving alms to the poor, which is commonly called *charity*, is evident from the third verſe, where it is ſaid, 'That although I beſtow all my goods to feed 'the poor, and have not charity, it profiteth me no-'thing:' So that here *love* is ſet above all the chriſtian

From this principle of beauty, which he has made the foundation, as we have ſeen,

virtues. Now, the object, as I have ſaid, of love is *beauty*; and we muſt underſtand it here not to be the beauty of outward form, but of the mind, that is, of ſentiments and actions. And tho' we may and ought to do good offices, even to thoſe who have no ſuch beauty of character, it muſt proceed, if not from love to the perſon, from love to mankind, and to God, whoſe will we obey in doing ſuch offices of kindneſs. And, if the action be truly virtuous and religious, we muſt have a ſenſe of the beauty of the action, abſtracted from any conſideration of the perſon, who is the object of the action. In the end of the chapter St Paul ſpeaks of the love of God being but imperfect in this ſtate, in which we ſee the Divine Beauty but darkly, and as through a glaſs; but, in our future ſtate, we ſhall ſee it more perfectly, and as it were face to face: For then we ſhall enjoy the Beatific Viſion, and ſee the Beauty of the Divinity without a cloud. And, as *the beautiful* is the object of love, the ſame Apoſtle, in the firſt epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, after recommending prayer and thankſgiving, and deſiring them not to quench the Spirit, and not to deſpiſe propheſying, concludes with ſaying, παντα δοκιμαζετε, το καλον κατεχετε; as if without it nothing in religion could be perfect. Where we may obſerve, that we have tranſlated improperly the laſt part of the precept, by the words, *Hold faſt that which is good*; for the καλον and the αγαθον are diſtinguiſhed in Scripture language, as well as

both of virtue and religion, Shaftesbury has deduced a demonstration of the Being,

in other Greek writings, though, no doubt, they are nearly allied, *beauty* being the *good*, and the only good of our intellectual part.—See vol. ii. of Antient Metaphysics, p. 109. And accordingly the two words are frequently joined together by Greek writers, and also in Scripture language, as in the parable of the *sower* in Luke, speaking of the seed that falls into καλην γην, it is added ὁυτοι εισι ὁι τινες εν καρδιᾳ καλῃ και αγαθῃ ακουσαντες τον λογον, κατεχουσι, cap. vii. v. 15. where he have again mistranslated the word καλη by the English word *honest*. There is another text of the same Apostle Paul, which I will also quote: It is in the epistle to the Philippians, chap. 4. v. 8. where he sums up the whole duty of a Christian in these words, Το λοιπον, αδελφοι, ὁσα εστιν αληθῆ, ὁσα σεμνα, ὁσα δικαια, ὁσα ἁγνα, ὁσα προσφιλη, ὁσα ευφημα, ει τις αρετη, και ει τις επαινος, ταυτα λογιζεσθε. where the word σεμνα is likewise improperly translated by the word *honest*; for σεμνον not only denotes what is *beautiful*, but what is grave and dignified, that is, beauty of the highest and most respectable kind; and it ought rather to have been translated *venerable*. John the beloved Disciple is full of the praise of love, both in his gospel and his epistles, and particularly in his first epistle, chap. iv. v. 16. he says, 'God is Love; 'and he that dwelleth in Love dwelleth in God, and 'God in him.'—And he further says, that our love must be unmixed with fear; for he adds, v. 18. 'There 'is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear, be'cause fear hath torment; he that feareth is not made 'perfect in love.' From these authorities, I think I

as well as the Attributes of God, better, I think, than what is to be found in any modern book: For he has proved, from the order, regularity, and beauty we ſee in all the works of Nature above, below, and round about us, that Supreme Intelligence governs in the univerſe *; and, as there can be no beauty without an unity of deſign, and as ſuch unity appears to be in every particular work of Nature, and in the whole, as far as falls under our obſervation, he from thence very juſtly, I think, infers that there is but one Supreme Intelligence †.

may conclude, that pure *love* is of the very eſſence of the Chriſtian Religion; and, indeed, it is the religion of love, more than any other religion is, or ever was in the world: And, as we cannot conceive love without beauty, we muſt alſo conclude it to be the moſt beautiful of all religions. Thoſe therefore, who think that Chriſtians ought to ſerve God from the fear of puniſhment or hope of reward, without love of God or of our neighbour, know nothing of the true ſpirit of Chriſtianity, nor do they worſhip the Lord as they are directed by the Pſalmiſt, *In the Beauty of Holineſs*, Pſ. xcvi. v. 9. ſee alſo Pſ. xxix. v. 2.—1 Chron. xvi. v. 29. —2 Chron. xx. v. 21.

* Part ii. ſect. 4.

† Part iii. ſect. 1.

This way of reaſoning I like much better than the demonſtrations that are pretended to be given us of the Being, the Unity, and the Attributes of God, *a priori*, and without conſideration of his works. For I hold that in morality, phyſics, and even metaphyſics and theology †, we muſt reaſon from the effect to the cauſe, and not *vice verſa* from the cauſe to the effect, which may do very well after the cauſe is diſcovered, but is not at all proper for the inveſtigation of it. Neither do I approve, any more than my Lord Shafteſbury does, of arguing in this matter from the neceſſity of a firſt principle and beginning of

† The diviſion of philoſophy by Plato, and in general by all the antient philoſophers, was threefold, into Logic, or Dialectic as it was called by Plato, Ethics or moral philoſophy as we call it, and Phyſics. Now, under phyſics they comprehended what was afterwards called by Ariſtotle Metaphyſics, and which was nothing elſe but the cauſes or firſt principles of phyſical effects, and therefore, as philoſophy always inquires into the cauſes of things, was very properly comprehended under phyſics. See upon this ſubject *Laertius*, lib. vii. cap. 39. alſo Cicero *De Legibus*, lib. i. cap. 23. and his *Academics*, lib. i. cap. 5.

motion. For I hold, that the antient philoſophers were in the right, who maintained that there was no beginning of motion, nor conſequently any Firſt Principle, if by firſt principle is meant a principle prior to the exiſtence of the effects produced by it. The material world, therefore, I hold to be an eternal emanation of the firſt cauſe, ſuch as we believe the Second and Third Perſons of the Trinity to be, which, tho' in dignity and excellence, they be far ſuperior to the material world, are not prior in time. And this I will ſhew to be agreeable not only to philoſophy but to Scripture, if I ſhall live to publiſh my fourth volume of Metaphyſics *.

Dr Clarke, in his Demonſtration of the Being and Attributes of God, has acknowledged that the *Intelligence* of the Divinity cannot be demonſtrated except *a poſteriori*, that is, from facts. But he pretends that the exiſtence of a Supreme Being, Self-exiſtent, eternal, and One, may be

* See what I have already ſaid upon this ſubject, in Vol. I. of Ancient Metaphyſics, p. 259.

demonſtrated *a priori*; and accordingly he has given a demonſtration of it, with which, I confeſs, I am not ſatisfied; nor do I think it is poſſible in the nature of things. For, let me ſuppoſe that there was a time when no material world exiſted, which, I believe, is the general opinion; and let me alſo ſuppoſe, that beſides the Supreme Being, there exiſted an intellectual being ſuch as man, it is, I think, impoſſible that he could have had any proof of the exiſtence of a Being ſuperior to himſelf, or of any other being beſides himſelf. All he could know of any thing was from conſciouſneſs, by which he could only learn that he himſelf exiſted; for, as to any thing without us, it is only diſcovered by our ſenſations. Now, our ſenſations are nothing elſe but the actions of material objects upon our organs of ſenſe.

I think, therefore, that our author has judged it much better, when he has only attempted to prove from the works of creation, that there is one Supreme Intelligence in the univerſe, and that this Intelligence is alſo ſupremely Powerful, Wiſe,

and Good; and that what ſeems to be ill in the univerſe, is nothing elſe but appearances, ſuch as muſt neceſſarily be to us of capacities ſo limited, who can only ſee and comprehend but a ſmall part of the vaſt ſyſtem of the univerſe. This I hold to be a ſufficient proof of the doctrine of theiſm, without entering into queſtions whether the material world be from all eternity or not, and whether or not from the Supreme Intelligence have proceeded not only inferior intelligences and minds of every kind, but alſo matter and ſpace; ſo that God muſt be ſuppoſed to have produced not only the world, ſuch as we ſee it, but alſo the materials of which it is made, and the ſpace or room in which it is contained. Theſe are queſtions of ſubtle diſputation, with which the plain doctrine of theiſm ought not to be perplexed and embarraſſed. And, accordingly, I think Lord Shaftesbury has done well to avoid them *. He has proved, that the Divini-

* Such queſtions belong to a Metaphyſical work of the kind I am engaged in; and, if I ſhall ever publiſh the IV. Volume of my Metaphyſics, I will endeavour

ty has that in a ſupreme degree, which undoubtedly is Chief and Principal in the univerſe, I mean Intelligence; and alſo that he is All-powerful, Wiſe, and Good. Now, whoever believes that ſuch a Being exiſts, I ſay, is a complete theiſt.

I beg leave to add further upon this ſubject, that if, a man, from what he ſees of Nature, is not convinced that there is an order and ſyſtem of things in the univerſe, and conſequently that there is a Principle of Intelligence which there governs, cannot believe even in miracles; for a miracle is nothing elſe but a diſpenſation with the general laws of Nature, and a deviation from the eſtabliſhed order of things, in particular caſes. So that all miracles neceſſarily ſuppoſe ſuch general laws, and ſuch an eſtabliſhed order of things.

to ſhow that matter is likewiſe an eternal emanation of the Divine Being, but the laſt in point of dignity and precedence. As to ſpace, I think I have already ſhown that it is no more than a capacity of containing body, and therefore it is impoſſible to conceive that it could be created. See Metaphyſics, Vol. II. cap. 5.

But, however high my opinion may be of our author's philoſophy in this dialogue, I think it could have been ſtill more perfect, if he had been more learned in the antient philoſophy *. What he has ſaid, for example, upon the ſubject of matter and motion, time and ſpace, would have been much better if he had ſtudied the philoſophy of Ariſtotle. Further, the diſtinction betwixt man and brute, or, in other words, betwixt our animal and intellectual part, he has not laid down ſo clearly and explicitly as he might have done, though it be evident that he acknowledged it. If he had done ſo, it would have been demonſtrable that the Beautiful was the only good of man, conſidered as man, that is, as an intellectual creature: For nothing elſe can be conceived to give pleaſure or delight to the intellect, other than the beautiful; whereas many things give pleaſure to our animal nature, and may be ſaid properly enough to be *good* to it, which have not the leaſt of beauty in them †. The

* Ancient Metaphyſics, Vol. II. p. 117.

† Ibid. p. 104.—109. 110.

ſame things are *good* to the brute; but, as he is merely a ſenſitive animal, and not an intellectual, he has no other good, nor any perception, as our author tells us, of the beautiful.

If this diſtinction be well underſtood, there is an end of that famous paradox of the Stoics, and which was the foundation of their whole philoſophy, that virtue (under which they included every quality and diſpoſition of the mind that was amiable and praiſe-worthy, and even ſciences, ſuch as dialectic and phyſics *,) was the only good of man. For it appears that, inſtead of being a paradox, it is a clear and evident propoſition; and that the difference betwixt them and the other philoſophers, ſuch as the Peripatetics and thoſe of the Academy, was, as Cicero has obſerved †, only in words and not in things. For, in the firſt place, the Stoics agreed with the other two ſects of philoſophers, that the *pulchrum*

* Cicero *De Finibus*, lib. iii. *in fine*.

† Ibid. lib. 4.

and the *honeſtum*, that is, the beautiful, was eſſential to virtue, being part of its definition, and that, without which it could not exiſt. This was not only the doctrine of the three ſects above mentioned, but of an older, and I think a better ſchool of philoſophy than any of them, I mean the Pythagorean ſchool, as I think I have ſhown very clearly elſewhere *. And I will venture to affirm, that, whoever would ground virtue and morality upon any other principle, than a ſenſe of the fair and the beautiful in ſentiments and actions, however learned he may be in other ſpecieſes of animals, knows nothing of his own, being ignorant even of the difference betwixt himſelf and a brute, which conſiſts chiefly in the perception of the pulchrum and honeſtum, not given as I have ſaid to the brute. *2dly*, The Peripatetics and Academics did not, nor could not, diſpute that virtue, in the large ſenſe I have mentioned, was the good and the only good of the intellectual part of our compoſition.

* Preface to Vol. III. of Ancient Metaphyſics, p. 34.

But they ſaid, that man was an animal compounded of body and mind, and of an animal and an intellectual nature: And they ſaid, that there was a good belonging to each of theſe natures: That undoubtedly virtue was the good of the intellectual, that is, the principal part of our nature; And that a virtuous life was a life according to Nature. But then we had another nature, viz. the animal; and we muſt live alſo according to that nature. We ought therefore to purſue what is agreeable to it, ſuch as health, the perfect uſe of our ſenſes, integrity of members, and what external things may be conducive to theſe ends, ſuch as money, reputation, and friends. Theſe therefore, though infinitely inferior to the goods of the mind, were ſtill good and deſirable things; and therefore, if we would live fully and completely according to our nature, as it is compounded of mind and body, we ought to labour to obtain theſe things, but in due ſubordination to our purſuit of the good of the principal part of our nature. Such things, therefore, the Peripatetics and Academics called good; and the contrary of theſe, ſuch as

pain, diſeaſe, mutilation, poverty, and the like, they ſaid were ills. But ſuch things, the Stoics ſaid, were neither good nor ill. Yet they made a difference among them: For what the other philoſophers called *good*, they ſaid were *things preferable*, and *to be choſen*; whereas the contrary of theſe were to be rejected, and avoided, as odious and contrary to nature, but not ill *.

It appears therefore, that it is true what Cicero ſays, that, though the Stoics pretended to introduce a new philoſophy, they did no more than give new names to old things, making philoſophy ſpeak a language, which they thought grander and more magnificent, than what it had for-

* For expreſſing theſe nice diſtinctions among things indifferent, which according to them were neither good nor ill, the Stoics invented the words προηγμενα, and αποπροηγμενα, which Cicero has rendered into Latin, by the words *praepoſita* and *rejecta* vel *rejectanea*; Lib. iii. *De Finibus*, cap. 15. et 16. et lib. iv. cap. 26. or, as he has expreſſed it at more length, he ſays the things of the firſt kind are *Res aptae, habiles, et ad naturam accommodatae*; ibid. lib. iv. cap. 20. the other he ſays are *Res aſperae, moleſtae, odioſae, contra naturam, difficiles toleratu*; ibid cap. 19.

merly ſpoken under Plato and Ariſtotle, and the ſucceſſors of their ſchool. At the ſame time, I am ſo far diſpoſed to adopt the language of the Stoics, and of this dialogue of Lord Shafteſbury, that I would give only to the good things of the mind the name of *good* by way of eminence; and would ſay that the beautiful, being the only object of love, was *good* and *good only*, and that the other things above mentioned, which are commonly ſaid to be good, ought only to be called *uſeful*, and this only in ſo far as they contribute to what is *good*: And the fact is certain, that health, ſtrength, vigour of body, and external things, ſuch as wealth and reputation, if they be not uſed for the purpoſes of virtue, and of what is truly good and beautiful, are not to be conſidered as good or even uſeful, but, on the contrary, as pernicious. I think, therefore, thoſe other philoſophers did not ſpeak ſo properly as the Stoics, when they dignified with the name of *good*, things of nature ſo ambiguous, and which were either good or ill according to the uſe made of them. But, I think, that the Stoics went much too far

on the other hand, when they denied that health, wealth, and friends, though made the proper uſe of, were any addition to virtue, or made the poſſeſſor more happy, than he would be without them. I am therefore of opinion, that the Peripatetics, and before them the Pythagoreans, were perfectly in the right, who defined happineſs to be the exerciſe of virtue in a perfect life, that is, in a life enjoying thoſe advantages I have mentioned.

Theſe are the things, and the only things which occur to me at preſent that may be obſerved as defects in the philoſophy of this dialogue: For, as to his not defining what the beautiful is, though he has talked ſo much of it, it is a defect, which he has in common, as I have obſerved elſewhere *, with all the philoſophers of antiquity, whoſe writings have come down to us: And, upon the whole, I am not afraid to pronounce the Rhapſody, not only the beſt dialogue in Engliſh, out of all degree of

* Ancient Metaphyſics, Vol. II. p. 105. 106.

compariſon, but the ſublimeſt philoſophy, and, if we will join with it the Inquiry, of which, as I have ſaid, it is to be conſidered as a ſupplement, the completeſt ſyſtem both of morality and theology that we have in our language, and at the ſame time, of the greateſt beauty and elegance for the ſtile and compoſition.

Whatever may be ſaid againſt other writings of Lord Shafteſbury, I never heard any ſerious objection made againſt this piece of his, though I know Mr Pope has endeavoured to ridicule the *rapturous viſions of Theocles*. And I know very well that in my younger days, that is, about 50 years ago, all his writings, and particularly his Rhapſody, were much eſteemed. But I do not know how it has happened, none of his writings at preſent appear to be in any eſtimation. I ſhould wonder the more at this, if I did not know ſome other fine writings that appear to be forgot in much leſs time, ſuch as the Art of Health by Dr Armſtrong, as fine a didactic poem as in any language, and for diction and verſification not exceeded by any thing in Engliſh;

and the Caſtle of Indolence, written by his friend Mr Thomſon, is the beſt allegorical and deſcriptive poem that I know in any language, and the richeſt and beſt rhyming verſification, for ſo long a work, that is to be found in Engliſh.

As to my Lord Shafteſbury's works, they are now ſo much out of faſhion, that I have no doubt that I ſhall give offence to ſeveral readers, by endeavouring to bring them again into vogue. But I do not write to flatter the prejudices of any man or ſet of men, but to do juſtice to all authors, both antient and modern, dead or living, as far as I am able. The faults of Lord Shafteſbury I have cenſured pretty freely elſewhere *, and particularly the too great freedom which he has uſed with religion upon ſome occaſions, to which he appears to have been provoked by the arrogance and high ſtile of authority, which was aſſumed by ſome churchmen of thoſe days †.

* Vol. III. p. 284.—p. 206. and 207. of this Vol.

† See what he has ſaid upon this ſubject, in the end of his laſt Miſcellany.

But in this work, at the ſame time that he has eſtabliſhed the truth of natural religion, better than any other writer in Engliſh, there is not a word in the whole work that carries the leaſt inſinuation againſt the Chriſtian religion; but, on the contrary, he makes Palemon, in the end of the ſecond ſection of the firſt part, ſpeak of Chriſtianity in the moſt reſpectful terms *.

And what have we got to put down ſuch an author as Lord Shafteſbury? Writings, which for the honour of the nation

* His words are, 'As averſe as I am to the cauſe 'of *theiſm* or name of *deiſt*, when taken in a ſenſe ex- 'cluſive of revelation, I conſider ſtill, that in ſtrict- 'neſs, the root of all is *theiſm*; and that to be a ſet- 'tled Chriſtian, it is neceſſary to be firſt of all a *good* 'theiſt. For *theiſm* can only be oppoſed to *polytheiſm* 'or *atheiſm*; nor have I patience to hear the name of 'deiſt (the higheſt of all names) denied, and ſet in 'oppoſition to Chriſtianity. As if our religion was a 'kind of magic, which depended not upon the belief 'of a ſingle Supreme Being; or as if the firm and ra- 'tional belief of ſuch a Being on philoſophical grounds, 'was an improper qualification for believing any thing 'further.—Excellent preſumption, for thoſe who na- 'turally incline to the diſbelief of revelation, or who 'through vanity affect a freedom of this kind.'

ought not to be mentioned. Original works of genius and learning we have hardly any, good or bad. It is all occaſional publications to ſerve the purpoſe of the day, or it is editions of claſſics, that have been better publiſhed many years ago, or tranſlations of them of no uſe to the ſcholar; or it is, at beſt, compilements of antient or modern hiſtory; but even theſe, for the greater part, written in ſuch a ſtile, that they can hardly be read, for information of facts, by thoſe who have formed their taſte in writing upon the ſtudy of the antient authors. As to philoſophy or ſcience, we can expect nothing of that kind of the leaſt value, now that the antient philoſophy is laid aſide. But what our writings want in beauty and excellence, they make up in number; for not only of annual productions, but of monthly, weekly, and, I may ſay, daily, the multitude is ſuch, that if a man were to read them all, he could read nothing elſe, and hardly do any thing elſe. I would have thoſe writers of the day, who affect to deſpiſe ſuch an author as Lord Shafteſbury, try to produce a dialogue like the Moraliſts; or, if they ſay that they have not time or leiſure to com-

poſe a work of ſuch length, (for I am ſure they will not think that they want genius and learning,) let them try to write but a letter of ſuch elegance of ſtile, and politeneſs of compliment, as the Letter on enthuſiaſm.

A kinſman of my Lord Shafteſbury, the late Mr Harris, has written two dialogues, one upon Art and another upon Happineſs. But neither of them is a dialogue, according to my definition of that kind of writing; for they have no ſtory or fable worth mentioning, nor characters or manners. They want too entirely thoſe incidents and turns, with which a dialogue ought to be varied. They are, therefore, truly no more than an analyſis by way of queſtion and anſwer, the one of a complex idea, viz. that of *art*, the other of a more complex idea ſtill, and of much greater importance in human life; I mean the idea of *happineſs*. They are therefore no more dialogues than an analyſis of a geometrical propoſition, carried on in the ſame way. They are, however, works of a great deal of merit, particularly the laſt mentioned, in which there is much excellent phi-

loſophy. The ſtile too is chaſte and correct, but not near ſo much adorned and animated as that of his kinſman; and, particularly, he falls very much ſhort in his attempt to imitate my Lord's high ſtile in the rhapſodies of Theocles; and tho' his rhapſodies were as good of the kind, they are not ſo well ſuited to the perſonages he introduces. I would recommend, however, to every ſtudent of ancient philoſophy, to begin rather with his dialogues, particularly that upon happineſs, than with my Lord's dialogue; for, he appears to have ſtudied the antient books of philoſophy, more than my Lord, and he abounds in quotations from them, the moſt of which he has taken the trouble to tranſlate. And, upon the whole, I think him, next to my Lord Shafteſbury, the beſt writer of this age upon the ſubject of philoſophy, both for matter and ſtile. I will only further add, that I am very glad of this opportunity of doing juſtice to an author, whom I had the pleaſure of knowing intimately, and eſteemed very much not only as an excellent ſcholar, and a good writer, but as a man of worth. He firſt began, as I

have elſewhere acknowledged, the attempt, which I have endeavoured to carry on, of reviving the ancient philoſophy, of which I got the firſt taſte from his writings; and I made conſiderable advances in it, both by his converſation and by correſponding with him. And I have ſeveral letters of his in my poſſeſſion, upon which I ſet a great value, as memorials of his eſteem and regard for me.

And here I conclude the ſubject of dialogue-writing, upon which I have enlarged the more, that I think it the fineſt of all writing in proſe: And it has the greateſt beauty of poetry, namely a fable and manners. Even in a narrative poem, ſuch as Homer's Iliad and Odyſſey, dialogue is one of the greateſt beauties; and, I think, it is not without reaſon that Ariſtotle commends Homer for ſpeaking ſo little himſelf, and making others ſpeak ſo much *.

* His commendation of Homer in this reſpect is very high; for he ſays, that Homer alone, of all poets, underſtood what he himſelf ought to do. Ὅμηρος δὲ ἀλλα τε πολλα ἀξιος επαινεισθαι, και δη και ὁτι μονος των ποιητων ουκ

Nor indeed do I think that any kind of writing can be perfectly fine without dia-

αγωσι ὁ δει ποιειν αυτον. Αυτον γαρ δει τον ποιητην ελαχιστα λεγειν. Ου γαρ εστι κατα ταυτα μιμητης. Οι μεν ουν αλλοι, αυτοι μεν δι' ὁλου αγωνιζονται, μιμουνται δε ολιγα και ολιγακις. Ὁ δε ολιγα προιμιασαμενος, ευθυς εισαγει ανδρα η γυναικα, η αλλο τι ηθος, και ουδεν αηθες, αλλ' εχον ηθος. (περι Ποιητικης, Cap. 24.) The praiſe, which Ariſtotle here beſtows upon Homer, may ſeem extravagant; but the meaning of it I take to be, 'That, of all the poets, who imitated 'as Homer does, partly by narrative and partly by dia-'logue, He alone divided the two parts properly, and 'did not give too much to the narrative.' And here I cannot help ſtopping to correct a text in the *Poetics* upon this ſubject, which, as it ſtands in all the editions, and likewiſe, as I ſuppoſe, in the MSS. is altogether unintelligible; nor is it corrected in a late edition of the *Poetics* from Cambridge, which I have ſeen. It is, when ſpeaking of the different manners of imitation in poetry, (for all poetry, according to Ariſtotle, is imitation), he ſays, Ετι δε τουτων τριτη διαφορα· το, 'ως 'εκαστα τουτων μιμησαιτο αν τις. Και γαρ εν τοις αυτοις και τα αυτα μιμεισθαι εστιν, ὁτε μεν απαγγελλοντα, η 'ετερον τι γιγνομενον, 'ωσπερ Ομηρος ποιει· η 'ως τον αυτον και μη μεταβαλλοντα, η παντας 'ως πραττοντας και ενεργουντας τους μιμουμενους. (Cap 3.) Here, in order to make the paſſage intelligible, you muſt make two corrections, firſt after ὁτε μεν απαγγελλοντα, you muſt read ὁτε δε (in place of η) 'ετερον τι γιγνομενον, otherwiſe it is not ſenſe; nor is there any thing anſwering to the μεν in the firſt part of that member of the ſentence: And in

logue, more or leſs. I have choſen for my text on this ſubject, two of the fineſt dialogues I know, that of Cicero *De Oratore*, and my Lord Shafteſbury's Rhapſody, both, I think, very fine, and the laſt without diſpute the fineſt in Engliſh; for his Lordſhip appears to me to have had a genius, which fitted him peculiarly for this kind of writing: And accordingly, not only in the Rhapſody, where he is a profeſſed dialogiſt, but in his other works, he has intermixed a great deal of excellent dialogue *, imitating in that reſpect, as I

the laſt member, in place of τους μιμουμενους, which has no ſenſe at all, you muſt read μιμουμενον. And then the whole ſentence will be perfectly intelligible, expreſſing, clearly, and diſtinctly, the three different ways of imitation, either by narrative only, or by dialogue only, that is, by introducing all the perſons acting and ſpeaking, or in both ways as Homer imitates. See a paſſage from Plato, which I have quoted in Vol. III. of this work, p. 126. where the reader will find explained, what Ariſtotle means by ἑτερον τι γιγνομενον.

* There is a very ſhort dialogue, which he has thrown into his *Soliloquy*, or *Advice to an Author*, ſect. 3. in the beginning. It is ſo pretty and natural, that I cannot help tranſcribing it; it is where ſpeaking of

have elſewhere obſerved, Horace, the chief beauty of whoſe ſatires and epiſtles is the dialogue in them: And I am not ſure but his beſt ode is the dialogue betwixt him and Lydia *. My Lord Shafteſbury, in his dialogues, has avoided that fault in his ſtile of being too copious, and ſometimes overloaded with epithets; for his dialogue is altogether in the ſtile of converſation, which does not admit

the juſtneſs and truth of workmanſhip, he makes a poor mechanic ſay to a rich cuſtomer, 'Sir, you are 'miſtaken for coming to me for ſuch a piece of work-'manſhip: Let who will make it for you, as you fan-'cy; I know it to be *wrong*: Whatever I have made 'hitherto, has been *true work*; and neither for your 'ſake or any body's elſe, ſhall I put my hand to any 'other.' Here he has imitated the ſtile of a common mechanic; but he has in the ſame piece, ſect. ii. a longer dialogue, in the form of a ſoliloquy, in a higher ſtile and upon a much nobler ſubject: It is too long to be here inſerted; but I call again upon the faſhionable wits and critics of this age, who think meanly of my Lord Shafteſbury's ſtile, to try whether they can do any thing better upon the ſubject.

* Book iii. ode 9.

of an exuberance of words, or multitude of epithets: And where he introduces gentlemen ſpeaking, it is altogether the converſation of gentlemen. And, in general, there runs through his whole writings a certain liberal air, and gentleman-like manner*, without which, I think, nothing can be agreeably either ſpoken or written. The greateſt learning and ſcience, without it, cannot pleaſe though it may inſtruct.

* See Vol. III. p. 284. and 285.

CHAP. IX.

Of the ſtile of Hiſtory.—*Of the difference betwixt* Hiſtory *and* Biography.—*The ſubject of hiſtory is narrative.—Whatever is not narrative in hiſtory is epiſodical.—What epiſodes are proper for hiſtory.—not political or philoſophical reflections upon human nature, ſuch as thoſe of Salluſt in the beginning of* Cataline's conſpiracy, *and of the* Jugurthine war.—*Explanations of particular cuſtoms and manners of a nation, a proper epiſode in hiſtory.—Difference in this reſpect betwixt the Greek hiſtorians of Roman affairs, and their own.—Of the* rhetorical ſtile *in hiſtory.*—Speeches *in it, not digreſſions or epiſodes but matters of fact and parts of the ſtory.—Speeches make political and philoſophical reflections not improper in hiſtory.—Hiſtory therefore a moſt pleaſant and various compoſition;—but the* poetical *ſtile, a variety which hiſtory does*

not admit.—Of the peculiarities of the poetical ſtile which hiſtory does not admit, ſuch as Epithets, Similies, Metaphors, *and* Minute Deſcriptions.—*Of the* painting *in Homer, and the difference in that reſpect betwixt his ſtile, and the ſtile of hiſtory.—Of the choice of words in the hiſtorical ſtile.—Difference, in that reſpect, betwixt the ſtile of Homer and of hiſtory.—Of the* Compoſition *in hiſtory, by which the ſtile of it is chiefly to be diſtinguiſhed from common ſpeech;—not to be diſtinguiſhed in that way by* variety of arrangement, *as in Greek and Latin, but only by* Periods.—*Of the great beauty of* Periods.—*Quotation upon that ſubject from Ariſtotle, ſhowing, that he thought there could be no beauty, without a* Syſtem *and a* Whole.—*There is nothing that can be properly called* Compoſition *without periods.—Of the defect of Salluſt and Tacitus in this reſpect.—The ſtile of Tacitus worſe than that of Salluſt.—One example of a Greek author, who writes like Salluſt.—Such compoſitions ſtill more inexcuſable in Greek than in Latin.*

I AM now to treat of the ſtile of Hiſtory, according to the order I propoſed to follow in this work *. By hiſtory I mean not the hiſtory of flies or reptiles or of other animals, commonly called natural hiſtory; but the hiſtory of *man*, and not of particular men, but of nations: For I diſtinguiſh betwixt biography and hiſtory, as I diſtinguiſh betwixt an individual and the nation of which he makes a part.

That the ſtile of hiſtory ought to be different from the ſtile of converſation or dialogue, of which I have already treated, or from the didactic, the rhetorical, and poetical, of which I am to treat, muſt be evident at firſt ſight: And I am now to ſhow wherein that difference conſiſts.

As the ſubject, or matter treated of, is principal in every work, the ſtile ought to be ſuitable to it †. Now, the ſubject of

* Page 291.

† Page 291.

hiſtory, is the narrative of the tranſactions of a nation. Whatever therefore in hiſtory is not narrative, muſt be conſidered as not principal, but only epiſodical; and if the epiſodes are too long, or not belonging to the principal ſubject, and ariſing naturally out of it, the work is in that reſpect faulty. The queſtion therefore is, what epiſodes are proper for hiſtory? How frequent? And how long continued?

In the firſt place, I think it is evident, that philoſophical reflections upon government, or political diſſertations, are not the proper buſineſs of hiſtory, which, no doubt, furniſhes a text for them; but it is not the buſineſs of the hiſtorian to be the commentator upon that text. This he ought to leave to the reader; and all that he has to do, is to give him a text exact and correct. I therefore take upon me to condemn all digreſſions of that kind, eſpecially when they run out to any length, ſuch as the political reflections of Salluſt upon the Roman ſtate, in his introduction to *Cataline's conſpiracy*, or his philoſophical obſervations on human nature, in his preface to his *Jugurthine*

war; both which might have been proper, if he had been writing a ſyſtem of morals or politics, or might have been more excuſable, if he had been writing a general hiſtory of the Roman ſtate, but, I think, are very foreign to the hiſtory of ſingle events in a nation, ſuch as the conſpiracy of Cataline, or the war of Jugurtha *.

But by what I have ſaid, I would not be underſtood to mean, that the explanation of particular cuſtoms and manners of the nation whoſe hiſtory you write, is improper in hiſtory; but, on the contrary, I think it is extremely proper; and I regret very much, that the Roman hiſtorians have not been at more pains to explain ſeveral things of that kind.—Their excuſe is, that ſuch explications were quite unneceſſary to thoſe for whom they wrote. But they ſhould have conſidered, that they were writing for poſterity, and for men of other nations, who knew nothing of the Roman cuſtoms

* This is the judgment of Quintilian, *Salluſtius, in bello Catalinario et Jugurthino, nihil ad hiſtoriam pertinentibus principiis orſus eſt*; Lib. iii. cap. 10.

and manners. And, indeed, this defect in them would have made the Roman hiſtory hardly intelligible to us, if it had not been ſupplied by the Greek hiſtorians, particularly by the Halicarnaſſian and Polybius; who, writing for their own countrymen, have been at pains to inform us of many things concerning the cuſtoms of the Romans both in peace and war, and the nature of their government, which otherwiſe we could not have underſtood. It appears, therefore, that hiſtory may have ſomething of the didactic ſtile in it.

But what ſhall we ſay of the rhetorical ſtile, I mean the ſtile of the ſpeeches in the antient hiſtories? Are they foreign to the ſubject? And I ſay they are not, but, on the contrary, very proper; for they not only vary the ſtile moſt agreeably, and relieve the reader from the diſguſt of hearing nothing but facts, without reaſon or argument; but they are a part, and a material part of the hiſtory of nations, where the public buſineſs was carried on chiefly by ſpeaking; for, in ſuch a nation, the ſpeeches are to be conſidered as matters of

fact: And accordingly Thucydides tells us, that the ſpeeches he has given us, many and long as they are, were really ſpoken, at leaſt in ſubſtance, he himſelf having heard them, or being informed by them who heard them*. And, even where the hiſtorian could have no ſuch knowledge, which is the caſe of Livy and the Halicarnaſſian, with reſpect to the ſpeeches which they put into the mouths of the perſonages of the firſt ages of the Roman ſtate; yet, as we are ſure that public buſineſs was then carried on by ſpeaking, as well as in later times, they are not at all improper, more eſpecially as they give the hiſtorian an opportunity of explaining the counſels and motives of actions, without digreſſing or letting his ſtory ſtand ſtill. Such ſpeeches, therefore, are not to be conſidered as epiſodes, but as parts, not ornamental merely, but very uſeful, of the hiſtory.

And here the author has an opportunity of bringing into his work, without violating the rules of hiſtory, political, and even philoſophical reflections, and likewiſe

* Lib. i. cap. 22.

a good deal of the hiſtory of other nations, by way of example, and of the ſame nation in more antient times.

And thus it appears, that hiſtory is a moſt pleaſant and various compoſition, taking in not only the narrative but the didactic and rhetorical ſtiles, and even ſomething of the philoſophy of morals and politics, together with examples from the hiſtory of other nations and of other times.

It remains therefore only to be inquired, whether hiſtory does not partake of the poetical ſtile, as well as of the other ſtiles I have mentioned: And I ſay it does not; and that hiſtory is as different from poetry, as it is from painting; for, as Horace ſays, *uti pictura poeſis.* And the chief difference betwixt poetry and painting is the inſtrument of imitation, painting imitating by lines and colours, poetry by words. And hence comes the difference betwixt the ſtile of poetry and hiſtory. One of the chief characteriſtics of the poetical ſtile is epithets, by which the object is repreſented to the imagination, as it is by painting to the eyes; and it is for this reaſon, that

Homer abounds ſo very much in epithets, beſtowing them not only on perſons, but on things; and even the moſt common things, ſuch as earth and water, which in that manner may be painted or repreſented to the imagination in poetry, as to the eye in painting. But in hiſtory, even perſons the moſt illuſtrious, ought not to be deſcribed in that way; I condemn therefore in hiſtory the deſigning perſons by epithets, ſuch as *the brave Prince*, *the gallant warrior*, *the philoſophic ſage*, and the like; though I know ſuch expreſſions are reckoned ornaments of the hiſtorical ſtile by thoſe who cannot make the proper diſtinction betwixt the ſtile of poetry and of hiſtory. And as to *things*, I ſay there ought never an adjective to be applied to any ſubſtantive, merely for the ſake of adorning it, or exciting any paſſion in us, which is the proper definition of an epithet, but only for the purpoſe of narrative or argument. Then there is the uſe of ſimilies, by which a thing that may not be ſo conſpicuous in itſelf, is made more conſpicuous by compariſon with another thing. This figure very much ornaments the ſtile, by de-

ſcriptions of beautiful things in nature, or art; and accordingly the ſimilies of Homer are the moſt ornamented parts of his poems. Then there is the frequent uſe of metaphors in poetry, which are ſhort ſimilies: and, laſtly, there is a particular and a minute deſcription of things, called by the antient critics διατυπωσις *, by which things are ſo circumſtantially and accurately deſcribed, that a painter may repreſent them in colours, by exactly copying the deſcription given of them. Of this kind are many deſcriptions in Homer, and particularly one in the Odyſſey, where he paints as much, as is poſſible for words to do, an event moſt intereſting, as all of the kind in poetry are; I mean the diſcovery of Ulyſſes by his old nurſe, when ſhe was waſhing his feet, an event upon which his whole fortune and the cataſtrophe of the poem depended †. Now, ſuch

* See what I have ſaid on this *Figure*, Vol. III. p. 117.

† I do not know any ſo good a ſubject of painting, as this diſcovery; and, I am glad that ſo eminent a painter as Sir Joſhua Reynolds has choſen it for the ſubject of a picture, which he is to paint for the Ruſſian Prince Potemkin.

painting does not belong even to oratory, as I have elſewhere ſhown *, but much leſs to hiſtory. The reaſon of which is, that the chief end of poetry is to move the paſſions; whereas, the buſineſs of hiſtory is to inſtruct by a faithful narrative, accurate and circumſtantial enough to make the things be perceived by the underſtanding, but not ſo minute, or ſo much coloured, as to make them an object of the imagination. Such being therefore the difference betwixt poetry and hiſtory, I blame the ſtile of every hiſtory which abounds with epithets and ſimilies, or makes much uſe of metaphors that are not common in the language, or which, by a particular deſcription of things, applies itſelf to the imagination and paſſions.

The ſtile of hiſtory, as well as every other ſtile, conſiſts of two things, the choice of words, and the compoſition of theſe words: The laſt of which is acknowledged by all the maſters of the art to be the moſt difficult part, as well as that which gives

* Vol. III. p. 118.

the greateſt beauty to ſtile, when well executed. As to the choice of words in hiſtory, they ſhould be all the common words of the language, but of the beſt kind, that is, ſuch as are uſed by the politeſt and beſt educated men, ſpeaking or writing with gravity and dignity upon ſubjects of importance. Of metaphors and other tropes none ſhould be uſed but ſuch as are common and familiar, nor any words that are obſolete and antiquated. In this particular, Salluſt, as I have obſerved elſewhere*, is very faulty; for he abounds with obſolete words and phraſes, which are an ornament to poetry, if judiciouſly employed; and, accordingly, they are much uſed by Homer, in whom it is not difficult to diſcern two languages, the language of his own time, and that of times much more antient. And, I think, it is a very great beauty in the beſt rhyming poetry we have in Engliſh, I mean Mr Thomſon's *Caſtle of Indolence*. But I hold them to be improper both in hiſtory and rhetoric, or in any other kind of writing or ſpeaking, the ſubject of which is the ordinary affairs of life.

* Vol. III. p. 200.

The compoſition, therefore, is that by which the hiſtorical ſtile is chiefly to be diſtiguiſhed from any other. How much the ſtile in Greek and Latin may be varied and diſtinguiſhed from common ſpeech by a different arrangement of the words, I have more than once obſerved in the courſe of this work. But I have alſo obſerved, that the ſtinted genius of our language, ſo defective in its grammar, and wanting that variety of flection, and thoſe numbers and genders, by which words, at a diſtance from one another in poſition, are joined together in ſyntax, does not admit of that beautiful variety of arrangement, which, at the ſame time that it pleaſes the ear, conveys the ſenſe more emphatically *. Neither does the ſimple ſyntax of our language admit of all that variety of figures of conſtruction, with which Thucydides has adorned his ſtile ſo much, that, as the Halicarnaſſian has obſerved, the grammarians have not names for them all. Theſe figures, though they be what the antient critics call σολοικοφα-

* See what I have ſaid upon this ſubject, in my Diſſertation upon the compoſition of the ancients, annexed to Vol. II.

νεις, that is, *having the appearance of ſoleciſms*, yet, if they be not intemperately uſed, or ſo as to produce an obſcurity in the ſenſe, which is often the caſe in Thucydides, are a beauty of ſtile, but ſuch as our language does not admit. The only way therefore remaining, by which our hiſtorical ſtile in Engliſh can be diſtinguiſhed from common ſpeech, is by compoſition in periods. And, indeed, it is the greateſt beauty of all compoſition, whether in learned or unlearned languages, in proſe or in verſe. I have ſaid a good deal upon this ſubject elſewhere in this volume *, which I will not here repeat. In volume third †, I have given definitions of a period from Ariſtotle and Cicero, and have ſhown how much better the philoſopher has defined it than the orator; I have alſo illuſtrated what I have ſaid upon the ſubject by examples from Demoſthenes, Cicero, and Milton. I will only add here, that whoever is not ſenſible of the beauty of a period, does not appear to me to know

* Page 238. and following.

† Chapter 5.

what beauty is, which cannot be, as I have ſhown elſewhere *, without a ſyſtem and

* Metaphyſics, vol. II. p. 111. Ariſtotle ſpeaking of the fable of a tragedy, ſays, (*Poetics*, cap. 7.) that it muſt not only be a whole, having a beginning, middle, and end; but it muſt have a certain ſize or extent: For, ſays he, a beautiful animal, or whatever elſe is beautiful, conſiſting of parts, muſt not only have theſe properly arranged, but muſt likewiſe have a certain magnitude; for the beautiful conſiſts in order and magnitude. Therefore, ſays he, a very ſmall animal is not beautiful, becauſe we do not diſtinctly perceive the relation of the whole to its parts, nor is a very great animal beautiful, becauſe we cannot comprehend it, ſo that we do not perceive *the one* in *the whole*. Such, ſays he, would be an animal of 10,000 ſtadia. I will ſubjoin the words of the original, as I think the paſſage very remarkable: Ετι δε επει το καλον, και ζωον και ‘απαν πραγμα ὁ συνεστηκεν εκ τινων, ου μονον ταυτα τεταγμενα δει εχειν, αλλα και μεγεθος ‘υπαρχειν μη το τυχον· το γαρ καλον, εν μεγεθει και taξει εστι. διο ουτε παμμικρον αν τι γενοιτο καλον ζωον· συγχειται γαρ ‘η θεωρια εγγυς του αναισθητου χρονου γινομενη· ουτε παμμεγεθες. Ου γαρ ‘αμα ‘η θεωρια γινεται, αλλ’ οιχεται τοις θεωρουσι το ‘εν και το ‘ολον εκ της θεωριας· ‘οιον ει μυριων σταδιων ειη ζωον.—This paſſage I had not before me, when I wrote the chapter of Metaphyſics above quoted; but it gives me very great pleaſure to find, that my notions upon a ſubject, which has been ſo little conſidered by any author ancient or

a whole, of a certain extent, having beginning, middle, and end.

Not only is a period one of the greateſt beauties of ſpeaking or writing, but it is ſo eſſential to compoſition, that nothing deſerves the name of *compoſition*, which has not periods longer or ſhorter, but conſiſts altogether of ſhort ſentences, eſpecially if theſe ſentences are unconnected; yet this is the ſtile of Salluſt, which is ſo uniform in that reſpect, that I hardly remem-

modern, I mean the definition of the το καλον, and where I had ſo little light to guide me, none at all indeed, when I wrote that chapter, coincides ſo perfectly with Ariſtotle. Now, a period is a whole, as well as a fable of a tragedy: And, accordingly, Ariſtotle has defined it to be *that which has a beginning and an end* (he might have added *a middle too*) *in itſelf, and a ſufficient extent*. See the words of Ariſtotle quoted in vol. III. of this work, p. 57. The meaning of its having a beginning and end in itſelf is, that it muſt not be terminated by the ſenſe only, but by the ſound, ſo that the ear expects an end; which is not the caſe in the λεξις ειρομενη, as he calls it, in which the ear perceives neither beginning nor end; and therefore has not the pleaſure which a runner has, who ſees the goal before him.

ber any thing in him, which deſerves the name of a period. So that, ſuppoſing this kind of ſtile were in itſelf beautiful, it has not variety enough to make it fine writing; and from this ſo great uniformity, it is evident that it was ſtudied and affected. Now, an author may not have ſkill enough, or may not beſtow pains ſufficient to compoſe good periods. But, if he is at pains to make his ſentences ſhort, abrupt, and unconnected, he ſhows a very bad taſte, and labours to write ill. I will not here repeat what I have ſaid of the ſtile of Salluſt and of Tacitus in Vol. III. of this work, where I have beſtowed upon theſe two ſtiles the beſt part of three chapters *. I will only add here, that though Salluſt very well deſerves the cenſure which Seneca beſtows on him, of *amputatae ſententiae*, and *verba ante expectatum cadentia*, he does not deſerve to be charged with the third fault which Seneca imputes to him, viz. *obſcura brevitas* †; for I do not re-

* Chap. 11. 12. and 13.

† Seneca, epiſt. 114.

collect at preſent any paſſage in Salluſt that I think is obſcure. But as to Tacitus, he is moſt juſtly chargeable with all the three, and eſpecially an *obſcure brevity*, which has made notes upon Tacitus more neceſſary, I think, than upon any one Roman author; he has, beſides, much more of point and affectation of wit, than Salluſt. And, upon the whole, I reckon his ſtile much worſe than that of Salluſt, and among the worſt ſtiles that is to be found even in modern times.

In my obſervations upon his ſtile and that of Salluſt, I have ſaid *, that I know no author in Greek who wrote in that ſtile; but there has fallen lately into my hands a Greek author of the fourth century, Achilles Tatius, who has written a kind of romance or novel upon the ſubject of the loves of Clitaphon and Leucippe. His cut of ſtile is, if poſſible, ſhorter and more unconnected than that of Salluſt or Taci-

* Vol. III. p. 201.

tus *. Such a manner of writing is, I think, ſtill more inexcuſable in a Greek author than in a Latin, becauſe one of the greateſt beauties of the Greek is, as I have obſerved elſewhere †, that it abounds much more than the Latin in connecting particles, by which not only the words in the ſame ſentence, but ſentences themſelves, are connected together, ſo that there is no ſtop or gap in the compoſition.

* I will give the reader a ſpecimen of this author's ſtile; in the beginning of any work, one naturally expects ſome kind of compoſition; but this author's exordium is what follows: Σιδων επι θαλαττη πολις. Ασσυριων η θαλασσα. Μητης φοινικων η πολις. Θηβαιων ο δημος πατηρ. Διδυμος λιμην εν κολπῳ πλατυς. Ηρεμα κλειων το πελαγος. A little after, going on in the ſame ſtile, he ſays, Περιιων ουν και την αλλην πολιν, και περισκοπων τα αναθηματα, ωρων γραφην ανακειμενην γης αμμα και θαλασσης. Ευρωπης η γραφη. Φοινικων η θαλαττη. Σιδωνης η γη. Εν τη γη λειμων, και χορος παρθενων.

† Page 63.—66. of this Volume.

CHAP. X.

The hiſtory of Herodotus moſt various both in matter and ſtile.—The matter takes in the whole hiſtory of the world, as far as it was known, before his time.—Yet there is an unity in his work, ſuch as there is in Homer's poems.—He begins his work, as Homer does, with the cauſe of the wars betwixt the Greeks and Barbarians, which are the ſubject of his work.—Other things he has introduced as epiſodes.—Of the truth of the facts in Herodotus.—Theſe not credible to a man, who believes that men have always been the ſame in all ages and nations.—No lies in Herodotus.—Of the variety of his ſtile.—Not poetical, though like the ſtile of Homer;—very much figured, and yet neither rhetorical nor poetical.—It is compoſed in periods, but not rhetorical periods.—Examples of the periods in Herodotus.—Cicero miſtaken in ſaying, that there are

no numbers in Herodotus.—Of the ſpeeches in Herodotus;—there are but few, but theſe upon proper occaſions;—the matter of them excellent.—Not many reflections, nor philoſophical and political obſervations; but theſe to the purpoſe.—One example of them.—The dialect, in which he writes, Ionic.—He uſes much the terminations of the datives plural in that dialect.—No epithets, ſimiles, or picturesque deſcriptions in his ſtile, nor any of the ſtrong figures uſed by Homer.—One figure of Homer, much uſed by him, viz. dialogue.—Examples of Herodotus's dialogue.—His ſtile diſtinguiſhed in that way from that of every other hiſtorian.—Herodotus a religious hiſtorian.—All hiſtorians, as well as poets of the higher order, ought to be religious.—Herodotus not ſuperſtitious, or over credulous, in matters of religion.

BUT, leaving ſuch authors as Salluſt and Tacitus to their admirers, without a rival, at leaſt for me;—I proceed to

ſpeak of the firſt Greek hiſtorian, and, I think, the beſt both for matter and ſtile, the father of hiſtory, as he is called, and whoſe nine books are very properly named after the nine Muſes. The firſt excellence of every hiſtory is, as the Halicarnaſſian has obſerved *, a proper choice of a ſubject: And indeed, it is the chief thing to be conſidered in all the works of art; for, let the execution be ever ſo good, if the ſubject be mean and contemptible or in any other reſpect ill choſen, the piece cannot be fine. Now, the ſubject of Herodotus's hiſtory is the grandeſt and nobleſt that can well be imagined, concluding with the greateſt event which the hiſtory of man furniſhes, (I mean the expedition of Xerxes into Greece), whether we conſider the number of men employed in it, amounting, according to Herodotus's account, to above 5,000,000, the greateſt collection, I believe, that ever was made of the human race;—the prodigious works preparatory to it, in which the power of men

* Epiſt. ad Cn. Pompeium, cap. iii.

ſeems to have triumphed even over nature; or, whether we conſider the virtue of the Greeks oppoſed to ſuch a wonderful power, and which may be truly ſaid to have exhibited *Dignum Deo Spectaculum*; for never was ſo manifeſted, not even in the fictions of poets,

——*Quid virtus et quid ſapientia poſſit*;

or, laſtly, the conſequences which would have happened, if Xerxes had ſucceeded in that expedition, and which make it not only the greateſt war that ever exiſted in the reſpects I have mentioned, but alſo of the greateſt importance to mankind. For, if the Perſians had prevailed, the Greeks, the fineſt race of people that ever exiſted, would have been ſwallowed up and loſt in the great empire of Perſia, it being the cuſtom of the Perſians, as Plato informs us, to mix and confound the races of men, by tranſplanting nations from one country to another; an example of which Herodotus gives, in the inſtance of a Thracian nation, viz. the Paeonians, which Darius, the fa-

ther of Xerxes, tranſplanted far into Aſia*. With Greece would have been loſt all learning, philoſophy, and fine arts: For Egypt was conquered, and become a part of the empire; and, conſequently, the learning and the arts there deep in their decline. A good deal of their learning, indeed, had been brought into Italy by Pythagoras, and was then ſtill preſerved among his ſcholars: But we know, that ſoon after his ſchool was diſperſed; and what remains of his philoſophy at this day, we owe to the curioſity and diligence of the Greeks. So that, if the Greeks had been at that time conquered, it appears to me, that the Weſtern and Northern parts of Europe, which from them have got all their arts and learning, muſt have remained, at leaſt for many ages longer, in ignorance and barbarity, and, I believe, for ever; for it does not appear to me, that we ever could have invented any liberal art or ſcience; particularly here in Britain, we ſhould have been no better than the ſavages of North America,

* Herodotus, lib. v. cap. 14. et 15.

and in this reſpect worſe, that we have got wealth and luxury, againſt which the only preſervative is the learning and philoſophy of the Greeks. And thus it appears, that the cauſe of learning as well as of liberty was at ſtake upon the ſucceſs of Xerxes's expedition.

As the hiſtory of Herodotus, therefore, is the nobleſt, with reſpect to its matter *, that can well be imagined, ſo it is the moſt various and comprehenſive; for it contains the hiſtory of all the nations then known, and of Greece among the reſt, from the Trojan war, where Homer leaves off, down to the war with Xerxes, which happened

* See what further the Halicarnaſſian has ſaid, upon the choice that Herodotus has made for the ſubject of his hiſtory and his manner of treating it, compared with Thucydides's choice of his ſubject and his manner of treating it, in his *Epiſtle to Pompey*, above quoted, cap. 3. *et ſequen.* where, among other things, he has obſerved, that Herodotus's ſubject has in it a great deal of philanthropy, and muſt have been particularly agreeable to his countrymen the Greeks. And, I am perſuaded, when he recited his hiſtory in the great national panegyric of the Olympic games, he muſt have been heard with the greateſt pleaſure and admiration

only a generation before the author lived. To this ſo various hiſtory he has contrived to give an unity, (for the ancients eſteemed no work of any kind unleſs it was a whole or piece, without which, they conceived no beauty in any thing,) ſuch as Homer has given to each of his two poems. And what makes the unity of his work, is the ſame that makes the unity of Homer's poems, namely, the ſubject; which, he tells us, is the war betwixt the Greeks and Barbarians, concluded by the invaſion of Greece by Xerxes, in ſo far at leaſt, that the war ceaſed to be offenſive upon the part of the Barbarians, who were contented after that to defend themſelves, and at laſt could not even do that, but were conquered by the Greeks. This ſubject he has, like Homer, propoſed in the beginning of his work, and as Homer has begun his Iliad with narrating the cauſe of the quarrel betwixt Agamennon and Achilles, which is the ſubject of that poem, ſo Herodotus begins his hiſtory with narrating the cauſe of the war betwixt the Greeks and Barbarians, the ſubject, as I have ſaid, of his work. Then, as Homer has contrived to bring into his

two poems, by way of epiſodes, almoſt all the hiſtory of Greece before his time, ſo Herodotus has introduced into his work not only the hiſtory of the Greeks and Perſians, but the hiſtory of the Lydians, Aſſyrians, Medes, Scythians, and Egyptians; and, indeed, the whole hiſtory of the world then known; ſo that as to the variety of the matter he far exceeds Homer, and yet with all that variety the unity of the work is ſtill preſerved. For, as the ſubject of his hiſtory is the wars betwixt the Greeks and Barbarians, and as all nations were divided at that time into Greeks and Barbarians, the ſubject is comprehenſive enough to take in all the hiſtories of the ſeveral nations, with which he fills up his piece; and, indeed, every thing he relates, prior to Xerxes's expedition, may be ſaid to be preparatory of that grand event, which concludes his hiſtory. All the hiſtories, therefore, above mentioned are to be conſidered as epiſodes which he has introduced, not abruptly or unconnected with what goes before or follows; but all of them, like thoſe of Homer, are ſome way or other connected, not only with the

principal ſubject, but with one another; for he has the art of tacking ſtories together, and inſerting them one into another, like ſo many boxes in a caſe, more than any other author I know, without excepting even Homer; ſo that we inſenſibly ſlip from one ſtory to another, hardly knowing that it is an epiſode or a digreſſion. And, in this reſpect, as well as in many others, the Halicarnaſſian has very juſtly given the preference to Herodotus before Thucydides, who, he ſays, has contrived it ſo, as to make of one ſubject, viz. the Peloponneſian war, many ſubjects; whereas, Herodotus has had the art, of many ſubjects to make one*. And, as

* *Epiſtola ad Cn. Pompeium*, cap. 3. This whole epiſtle I would adviſe the learned reader to peruſe very diligently, as one of the beſt pieces of criticiſm that is any where to be found. I have obſerved ſome errors in it, whether of the printed edition or the MS. I cannot ſay; but ſome of them may be very eaſily corrected, and, I hope, will be corrected in ſome future edition to be given at Oxford. I will only mention one, that happens to be under my eye. It is in the third chapter of the epiſtle, where comparing the ſubject of Thucydides with that of Herodotus, he wonders that Thucydides

that is the chief art of a poet, I don't wonder that the Halicarnaſſian gives to Herodotus's hiſtory, the name of a poem *, which, I think, it much better deſerves than the hiſtory of Thucydides, to which the Halicarnaſſian alſo gives that name: But the truth is, that every artificial compoſition, ſuch as the hiſtory of Thucydides undoubtedly is, may be ſaid in ſome reſpects to be a *poem*.

As to the truth of the facts related by Herodotus, and which no doubt is the chief excellence of every hiſtory, I have ſpoken elſewhere †. A reader, who be-

ſhould have taken for his ſubject, a war ſo unfortunate to the Greeks, and particularly to the Athenians, being himſelf a Greek and an Athenian. And he adds, Και ταυτα ου των ετι ιερημενων οντα, αλλα ων εν πρωτοις ηγον Αθηναιοι, στρατηγων και των αλλων τιμων αξιουντες; where it is evident, that the words ου των ετι ιερημενων, have no ſenſe at all: And, therefore, it is plain, that in place of them, we ſhould read ου των φαυλων, (or ſome ſuch word) οντα. And accordingly, I obſerve it is ſo tranſlated.

* Ibid. cap. iii. *in fine.*

† Ancient Metaphyſics, Vol. III. p. 149.

lieves that men have always been the ſame in all ages and nations, that we now ſee them, and that there was no more communication betwixt men in ancient times and ſuperior intelligences, than there is now, will reject the greater part of the facts related by Herodotus, as altogether incredible; and, for the ſame reaſon, he will diſbelieve all ancient hiſtory, ſacred as well as prophane. To ſuch a reader I would give the advice, which Lord Bolingbrocke gives to the ſtudent of hiſtory; not to go farther back in his reading, than the days of Charles the Fifth, and ſo reſt ſatisfied with modern men and modern manners. As to Herodotus, it appears that no hiſtorian or traveller was ever at more pains to inform himſelf*. For the diſcovery of truth, and no other motive, he travelled over a great part of the world then known; and almoſt all that he relates of the different countries, was either what he ſaw himſelf, or learned from people of the country. And, as to his veracity, I do not believe that there is

* Ibidem.

a lye in the whole book; though no doubt he relates many things that are not true, and which he did not believe himſelf, as he tells us, even when he ought to have believed it, as we know now that they were certainly true *. There is only one other hiſtorian of antiquity, to whom we are as much obliged as to Herodotus for the pains he took to inform us concerning thoſe ancient times, that is, Diodorus Siculus, who travelled, as he tells us †, thirty years, and was in almoſt all the countries of which he ſpeaks. But even his hiſtory I think much inferior to that of Herodotus, both as to the matter and the ſtile.

As to the ſtile of Herodotus, it is almoſt as various as his matter; for he has diverſified his compoſition with every figure of conſtruction, and all the variety of phraſeology, as well as of order and arrangement of the words, that can well be imagined ‡; and this, joined with the peculia-

* Ibidem.

† Lib. i. cap. 4.

‡ See Dionyſius, De Thucydide, cap. 23.

rity of his dialect, makes his ſtile very obſcure, even to thoſe who are maſters of the Greek language, if they have not very diligently ſtudied his manner*. Yet

* I can excuſe the tranſlators and commentators, when, from the uſe of ſuch figures, and particularly the figure of ανακολουθια, which is not unfrequent in him, and from the peculiarities of his dialect, they miſtake his meaning, as they do in ſeveral paſſages that I have obſerved. But I cannot ſo eaſily pardon them, when, merely for want of a proper punctuation, they give an abſurd ſenſe, or no ſenſe at all, to a paſſage, ſuch as that in the ſecond book, where there is no error in the words, but only in the punctuation, which the new editor Weſſelingius might have corrected, if he had underſtood a note of one Valkenarius that he quotes, but which, it is clear both from his punctuation of the text, and from his tranſlation, he did not underſtand. I ſhall give the paſſage, as I had pointed it in my copy ſeveral years before this new edition appeared; without adding, taking away, or altering a ſingle word. The paſſage is in the 11th chapter of the ſecond book, where ſpeaking of the Arabian gulf, or Red ſea as we call it, and the gulf which the Mediterranean formed in Egypt, as he ſuppoſes, before the *Delta* was created by the river, he proves the poſſibility of ſuch a creation, by ſuppoſing the Nile to be turned into the Arabian gulf. The words are; Ει ων εθελησει τις τρεψαι το ρεεθρον ὁ Νειλος εις τουτον τον Αραβιον κολπον, τι μην κωλυει ρεοντος τουτου εκχωσθηναι υπο γε δεκαετιων ετεων; Εγω μεν γαρ ελπομαι γε και

with all this variety, he ſtill keeps within the bounds of the hiſtorical ſtile, and is neither rhetorical nor poetical: For, though many readers may think his ſtile poetical, becauſe he uſes many of the words and phraſes of Homer, I am perſuaded that thoſe words and phraſes were in common uſe among the Ionians in Aſia; and, indeed, it is very natural that it ſhould be ſo, when we conſider that Homer was of that country. If they had been eſteemed among the Ionians poetical or gloſſematical

μυριων ετος χωσθηναι αν. Και γε δη εν τω αναισιμωτερω προτερον η εμε γενεσθαι, ουκ αν χωσθειη κολπος και πολλω μειζων ετι τουτε ὑπο τοσουτε γε ποταμε και ουτως εργατικε; And the meaning of the paſſage, this way pointed, is plain; which is this: 'If the Nile ſhould run into the 'Arabian gulf, what ſhould hinder that gulf to be fill-'ed up in 20,000 years? For my part, I think it would 'be filled up in 10,000 years; and if ſo, how ſhould 'it have happened, that, in all the time which has 'paſſed before I was born, this gulf,' (meaning the Egyptian gulf,) 'or a much greater than this, ſhould not 'have been filled by ſo great and ſo operative a river?' ——I have only farther to obſerve, that this Valkenarius makes a fooliſh ſcruple about the phraſe προτερον η εμε γενεσθαι, of which, I am perſuaded, there are many examples to be found, if it were worth the while to look for them.

words, Herodotus was too well acquainted with the nature of the hiſtorical ſtile, to have uſed them; and, without their aid, he knew as well as any man a ſecret, that is but little known now-a-days,—that of making an uncommon ſtile of common words. It is for this purpoſe, and not from any confuſion of thought, or inaccuracy of language, (as modern vanity is apt to believe), that he uſes thoſe diſorderly conſtructions, as they ſeem to be, and thoſe prepoſterous arrangements, as it would ſeem, of the different members of the ſentence, which diſtinguiſh his ſtile very much from common language, and yet create no difficulty to a man well acquainted with the beauty and variety of the Greek language, and the manner of the author. The ſtile, therefore, of Herodotus is neither rhetorical nor poetical; for it has not thoſe antitheſes with which the rhetorical ſtile abounds ſo much, nor is it compoſed in rhetorical periods, though he compoſes very often in long periods, and, I think, the moſt beautiful periods of the hiſtoric kind: But they are not rounded and conſtricted, or contorted, as the ancient critics expreſs it, like thoſe of an

oration, but looſer and of a more eaſy and natural flow, according to the account which I have given of the hiſtorical period in another part of this work*. To perceive the difference betwixt theſe two periods, is a matter of taſte and pretty nice diſcernment, dependiag upon a ſenſe of what is proper, becoming, and ſuitable to the ſubject, without which we can neither write well, nor judge of good writing of any kind. And yet, as I have elſewhere obſerved †, it cannot be reduced to rules: But, if nature has beſtowed it upon us, (for no art can give it), we ſhall perceive, that a compoſition proper to enforce an argument, or to excite paſſion, muſt be different from plain hiſtorical narrative. Now, I think, there is no author who has better diſtinguiſhed thoſe two compoſitions, or whoſe narrative has a more eaſy natural flow, than that of Herodotus. Of a period of this kind the Halicarnaſſian has given us a very fine example from the be-

* Vol. III. p. 368.

† Page 244. of this Volume.

ginning of his hiſtory, where he deſcribes the boundaries of the kingdom of Croeſus; and the very firſt ſentence of his hiſtory, in which he propoſes his ſubject, and informs us of his deſign in writing, is, I think, a very good hiſtorical period. In thoſe periods of Herodotus, there are numbers which pleaſe even my ear, but muſt have pleaſed much more the learned ear of the Halicarnaſſian. I therefore hold, that Cicero is much miſtaken, when he ſays, that there are no numbers in Herodotus. There are not, indeed, ſuch numbers in his hiſtory as in Cicero's orations; but theſe numbers of Cicero do not pleaſe me even in the rhetorical ſtile, but they would be ſtill more unſuitable to the hiſtorical.

Herodotus, however, has ſpeeches in his hiſtory, as many as, I think, ſhould be in ſuch a general hiſtory as his: And they are excellent for the matter, and never introduced but upon a proper occaſion, ſuch as when Xerxes laid before his council the deſign he had formed of invading Greece; for, as there were different opinions given in that council, his method of dialogue,

of which I ſhall ſpeak by and by, would not have been there ſo proper. And, when the ſeven conſpirators againſt the Magi deliberate what form of government they ſhould eſtabliſh after pulling them down, Herodotus puts into the mouth of three of them, three political ſpeeches, one in favour of each of the three forms of government, ſuch as, for the beauty and propriety of the ſentiments, may be compared to any in Thucydides, or to the famous orations in Dion Caſſius of Moecenas and Agrippa, upon occaſion of Auguſtus's deliberation, about laying down the government, and reſtoring liberty to the people of Rome.

There are alſo very fine reflections interſperſed here and there in his narration, but only ſparingly and upon proper occaſions: For he is not every where ſententious like Tacitus, nor makes his hiſtory a lecture upon politics, but, contenting himſelf with relating the facts, leaves the reader at liberty to make his own commentary upon them. I ſhall give only one inſtance of a very ſhort but pertinent ob-

ſervation of his, which ſhows, that, from his travels and obſervations, he had acquired a very comprehenſive view of the hiſtory of man. It is upon the occaſion of his relating a very extraordinary fact indeed, that there was a people in the northern parts of Europe, beyond the Danube, who ſaid they were a colony of the Medes, and accordingly wore the Median dreſs. How this ſhould have happened, ſays he, I do not know; but παν γενοιτο αν εν τω μακρω χρονω*. 'Any thing may happen 'in a long ſpace of time.' And, indeed, there is nothing that one can imagine and is poſſible to have happened, but I believe actually has happened ſome time or other to the human ſpecies: And, particularly, it appears, that, by ſome accident or another, the different races of men have been ſtrangely jumbled together. Thus, beſides this colony of a nation ſo remote, found in the midſt of nations quite different in every reſpect, the ſame author tells us, that in the iſland of Cyprus, there were people of

* Teſpſichore, cap. 8.

many different nations, ſuch as Athenians, Salaminians, Arcadians, Cythnians, Phoenicians, and Æthiopians*. And this agrees with what travellers tell us of ſome of the countries they have diſcovered in the South Sea, where there are found people of all different colours and complexions, black, white, copper-coloured, red, brown, olive, and yellow.

Thus it appears, that the narrative of Herodotus, has nothing of the philoſophical or political caſt, any more than of the rhetorical. As to his ſpeeches, they are but few, for a reaſon before mentioned †: Nor

* Lib. vii. cap. 90.

† Page 430.—That he was deficient in the Rhetorical ſtile, or the ſtile of debate and contention, is the judgment of the Halicarnaſſian; (*De Thucydide Judicium*, cap. 23.); but he allows him every other virtue of ſtile. Diodorus Siculus has no ſpeeches at all in his hiſtory; not only becauſe his hiſtory was too general, more general ſtill than that of Herodotus, but, I believe, for another reaſon, the ſame for which there are no ſpeeches in our modern hiſtories; namely, that he was incapable of compoſing them.

is the compoſition of them ſo rhetorical as I could have wiſhed; for it does not appear that he ever practiſed that ſtile much, either in writing or ſpeaking. I therefore think, that the ſtile of his ſpeeches is inferior to the ſtile of thoſe of Thucydides, and ſtill more to that of the orations of Demoſthenes.

The dialect Herodotus writes in is, as as I have obſerved, the Ionic; a dialect, which I like better than any other in Greek, as being more vocal than any other, and coming nearer to the language of Homer (which I hold to be the perfection of the Greek language) and to the ancient form of language: For, I believe, that there has been an abbreviation of words in all languages after they were formed, and particularly a contraction of vowels ſtanding together, and of ſyllables; and ſome languages have been in that way made worſe, (as for example our own), and none better. I like therefore that concourſe of vowels, which the Attic writers ſhun ſo much: And thoſe Homeric terminations of οισι and ηισι I like very

much, if there be not too many of them together, which ſometimes happens in Herodotus *; but never in Homer. He has too a great many words and phraſes peculiar to the dialect in which he writes; of which Henry Stephen and Camerarius have made a full collection, very uſeful to the young Greek ſcholar. Of theſe there are many to be found in Homer; but I do not for that believe them to be poetical words, but, as I have ſaid †, the common language of the Ionians, though not uſed in the Attic dialect ‡. Beſides all this, he

* See Herodotus, lib. iv. cap. 22. where we have the following words, ſpeaking of a nation he calls Ινρκαι, conterminous to another nation he calls Θυσσαγιται. Συνεχεες δε τουτοισι εν τοισι αυτοισι τοποισι κατοικημενοισι εισι τοισι ουνομα κειται Ινρκαι.—Here there is a great deal too much jingle; but ſuch examples are very rare. In Homer, we have only two ſuch rhymes together, and never but in his ſimilies, where he deſcribes ſome very pleaſurable object, and wants to make his verſe very ſweet and flowing; as in the ſimile of the nightingale, in the Odyſſey, he has this line,

Δενδρεων εν πεταλοισι καθεζομενη πυκινοισι.

† Page 427.

‡ I recollect a paſſage in his third book, where, I am

uſes many of thoſe figures of conſtruction above mentioned *, which, though they throw the ſtile quite out of common idiom, yet, as they are uſed by Herodotus, create no obſcurity, but, on the contrary, ſerve very often to make the ſtile more perſpicuous than it would otherwiſe be.

He uſes too, as Homer does, frequent repetitions of the ſame word, and particularly of the pronoun αυτος, by which he connects very well the ſenſe of his long periods. He alſo uſes recapitulations, as Homer does, which gives a great perſpicuity to his narrative. But, though he uſes an arrangement of words artificial enough, he has not thoſe violent hyperbatons which we find in Homer, and which

perſuaded, he had Homer in view. It is where Homer deſcribes Bellerophon going to Lycia, Θεων συν αμυμονι πομπῃ. This he applies to the conſpirators againſt the Magi, when they went to attack them in their palace. But he has not uſed the ſame words; if he had done ſo, it would have been poetry: but he has ſaid, Θειῃ πομπῃ χρεωμενοι.

* Page 407.

are very proper for the poetical ſtile, but not for proſe. Neither are the parentheſes, with which he diverſifies his ſtile, ſo long as ſome of Homer's. And, as to epithets, ſimiles, and pictureſque deſcriptions, which are the proper ornaments of the poetical ſtile, and by which, more than by any thing elſe, it is diſtinguiſhed from proſe, he has nothing at all of the kind.

There is, however, one figure of compoſition which Homer has uſed very much, and in which Herodotus has imitated him more than any other hiſtorian; and indeed, it is the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtic of his hiſtorical ſtile, and makes his hiſtory, as the Halicarnaſſian obſerves*, as beautiful and pleaſant to read as any poem. The figure I mean is dialogue, by which he has made his compoſition in ſome ſort dramatical, and has given it one of the chief beauties of poetry, the imitation of characters and manners, though, as I

* *De Thucydide Judicium*, cap. 23.

have elſewhere obſerved *, it be one reaſon, beſides the ignorance of ancient cuſtoms and manners, that makes the modern reader, not acquainted with this art of writing hiſtory, believe the ſtories in Herodotus to be no better than poetical fictions. But ſuch readers ſhould conſider, that this is the moſt ancient way of writing hiſtory; and that the moſt authentic, as well as the moſt ancient hiſtory in the world, is written as much, or more in dialogue than the *Muſes* of Herodotus.

To quote all the dialogues in Herodotus, would be to tranſcribe a great part of his hiſtory: I ſhall therefore mention only one or two of them, by way of example. In the very beginning of his hiſtory, where he relates the ſtory of Candaules, King of Lydia, he introduces a dialogue betwixt him and his favourite Gyges, by which the folly of the King is better ſhown than it could have been by any reflections of the author, and much more properly

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 366.—Alſo Vol. III. of Anc. Metaph. p. 148.

than if he had interrupted his narrative by ſuch reflections. And the ſtory of Paris coming with Helen to Egypt, with what paſſed betwixt him and the Egyptian King, he has alſo related by way of dialogue; and a very fine dialogue I think it is, in which he has both aggravated the crime of Paris, much more properly than if he had let his ſtory ſtand ſtill to do it, and, at the ſame time, has given us the character of the Egyptian King, which is better done by introducing him ſpeaking, than by any deſcription. The longeſt dialogue in Herodous, and, I think, the beſt, is the converſation betwixt Demaratus, the exiled Spartan King, and Xerxes juſt come from the review of his prodigious forces: For, upon the one ſide, the pride and inſolence of a young monarch, who had armed and collected together a great part of the human race, and had covered the land with his armies and the ſea with his fleets, his inexperience and ignorance of liberty and its effects upon the minds of men, and the ſentiments naturally thence ariſing, are finely ſet forth: On the other hand, the wiſdom,

the experience, and the knowledge of Demaratus, particularly of that of which Xerxes was totally ignorant, I mean liberty, are very well repreſented.

Thus it appears, that Herodotus has with great propriety given to his hiſtory one of the greateſt beauties, as I have obſerved *, of writing, and has diſtinguiſhed his ſtile of hiſtory in that way from every other hiſtorical ſtile. Nor do I know any other hiſtorian, that has ſo much as attempted to imitate his dialogue, except Thucydides, but very unfortunately in the judgment of the Halicarnaſſian †.

I think, therefore, that the ſtile of Herodotus is the moſt agreeably diverſified,

* Page 390.—391.

† This dialogue of Thucydides is in the fifth book of his hiſtory, beginning p. 400 of Harry Stephen's edition, and is continued for ſeveral pages, being very much longer than any of Herodotus; and is truly, as the Halicarnaſſian obſerves, departing intirely from the hiſtorical ſtile, and making a drama inſtead of a hiſtory. See his obſervations upon it, *De Thucydide Judicium*, cap. 38.

and, upon the whole, the moſt beautiful ſtile of hiſtory that ever was written.

I cannot conclude this eulogium of Herodotus, without obſerving what the Halicarnaſſian thinks deſerves to be noticed in every hiſtorian, and that is the diſpoſition and character of the writer; and he obſerves, that there is a great deal of philanthropy in the character of Herodotus, delighting, as he does, in the ſucceſs of the good, and grieved with their misfortunes. But he has not mentioned one thing in his character, which I admire very much, that he is a religious hiſtorian, ſhowing his firm belief, not only that there is a God, but that his providence directs the events of human life, as well as the operations of nature. Who has not this knowledge of divine and human things cannot write well of the affairs of men, any more than he could give a good hiſtory of a particular nation, without knowing how that nation is governed; nor can he promote that prime virtue, *piety*, without which no other virtue can be perfect;

nor can there be any real happineſs among men. To recommend this virtue, I hold to be the duty of the hiſtorian, as well as of poets of the higher kind, ſuch as the heroic and tragic *. I therefore intirely diſ-

* That the Gods govern the affairs of men, and direct the events of human life, is the moral of the Iliad, Odyſſey, and Æneid; about which ſome modern critics have ſaid ſo much to ſo little purpoſe. And as to the tragic poets, Euripides commonly concludes his tragedies in this manner;

Πολλα δ' ελπτως κραινουσι θεοι,
Και τα δοκηθεντ' ουκ ετελεσθη·
Των δ' αδοκητων πορον ηυρε θεος·
Τοιον δ' απεβη τοδε πραγμα.

See what I have further ſaid in Volume I. of Ancient Metaphyſics, p. 498. of a governing providence and a preſent Deity, both in the works of nature and the affairs of men.——To which I will add a paſſage from Cicero, where, after enumerating ſeveral things in which other nations excelled his countrymen, he adds, 'Sed pietate ac religione atque hac una ſapientia, quod Deorum immortalium numine omnia regi gubernarique perſpeximus, omnes gentes nationeſque ſuperavimus..'——*Oratio de Haruſpicum Reſponſis* And, to this belief, I am perſuaded, they owed chiefly their glory and the conqueſt of the world.

approve of ſuch hiſtorians as Tacitus and his modern imitators, who either ſay nothing at all of providence, or, what is worſe, profeſs to believe that human affairs are governed either by blind chance or fatal neceſſity*; which muſt put an end at once to all practical piety, as much as the Epicurean philoſophy did of old.

Although Herodotus was religious, very religious, yet he does not appear to have been over credulous even in religious matters. The ſtory told him by the Chaldeans, that Jupiter Belus came down and lay upon a couch prepared for him in

* See Tacitus's *Annals*, lib. vi. chap. 22. And in his book *De Moribus Germanorum*, cap. 46. ſpeaking of a ſavage people in Germany, he ſays, that being 'Securi adverſus homines, ſecuri adverſus Deos, rem 'difficillimam aſſecuti ſunt, ut illis ne voto quidem o-'pus ſit.' This is aſſerting in the ſtrongeſt terms man's independency upon ſuperior beings, even if thoſe beings were diſpoſed to middle with human affairs, which, in the paſſage above quoted from the *annals*, he ſays, it was believed by many, (and among theſe I number himſelf,) that they did not, but that human affairs, were governed, as I have ſaid, either by blind chance or fatal neceſſity.

his temple in Babylon, attended by a woman conſecrated to his ſervice, he ſays he does not believe, though he was told the ſame ſtory by the Egyptian prieſts of their Jupiter in Thebes *: And it is evident, that neither did he believe what the ſame Egyptian prieſts told him, of two wolves conducting a blind-folded prieſt to a temple of Ceres, at the diſtance of twenty ſtadia, and bringing him back again †.

That Herodotus believed in dreams and in oracles, is no doubt true: And, if on that account he is to be reckoned ſuperſtitious and credulous, we muſt make the ſame charge againſt the whole ancient world, both civilized and barbarous. For my own part, I believe that even now, in theſe degenerate days, though not ſo frequently as in ancient times, there is ſometimes, upon particular occaſions, and for wiſe and good purpoſes, a communication betwixt our minds and ſuperior intelli-

* Lib. i. cap. ϱ. π. β.

† Lib. ii. cap. ϱ. π. β.

gences in our ſleep; of which I have known, in my time inſtances, not only vouched by moſt credible teſtimonies, but verified by events of public notoriety: And I have not yet learned, that the ancient Greek oracles, which were univerſally underſtood to be the wiſdom of the nation, directing them in all their affairs of moment, were mere impoſture and prieſtcraft; but, on the contrary, I believe, as the ancient fathers of the church did, that they proceeded from ſuperior intelligences, whether good or bad I determine not, but which were allowed to guide the councils of men, till the coming of our Saviour put an end to them.

CHAP. XI.

An account of the ſtile and manner of three other Greek hiſtorians: Firſt, of Thucydides; *—his ſtile is proſe, but made harſh and obſcure, by the affectation of ſingularity; —by this affectation, the taſte of other arts have been ſpoiled, as well as of writing.—The ſecond Greek hiſtorian mentioned in this chapter, is* Xenophon; *—his ſtile perfectly different; —too ſimple and too little Attic; —more of the ſtile of the Socratic dialogue than of hiſtory; —abounds too much with characters; —ſome apology for that.—The laſt Greek hiſtorian mentioned in this chapter, is* Diodorus Siculus; *—in ſtile much inferior to either Herodotus or Xenophon,—and more ſtill in point of matter; —his account of ſome great events mere fictions.—Other Greek hiſtorians, ſuch as* Dion Caſſius *and* Appian, *have uſed the ſame freedom with*

truth.—General obſervations.—Of the great excellency of contemporary hiſtorians above the compilers of hiſtory.

HAVING been ſo full upon Herodotus, who, I muſt confeſs, is my favourite hiſtorian, being, in my opinion, the moſt inſtructive as well as the moſt pleaſant of all hiſtorians, I will be very ſhort upon the ſubject of other three Greek hiſtorians, of whom I am to treat in this chapter. The firſt of them is Thucydides, of whoſe ſtile I have ſpoken at ſome length, in the third volume of this work*. It is, as the Halicarnaſſian obſerves, a moſt extraodinary ſtile of hiſtory, ſuch as no author before him wrote, nor has any ſince. Yet it is proſe; for the words are not poetical, and the figures of compoſition are ſuch as may be uſed in proſe as well as in poetry: But there are too many of them, and ſome of them too far removed from common ſpeech; nor is there enough of plain work, which is a fault

* Chap. xi. p. 198. 199.

in the writing art, as well as in any other. He has ſhown, more, I think, than any other author, that thoſe figures of words, by which the ſtile is diſtinguiſhed from common ſpeech, may be uſed to ſuch exceſs, as to make the ſtile harſh and uncouth, and not at all natural or perſuaſive: For a ſtile ſo laboured and ſo artificial, does not diſpoſe us to believe the truth of the facts related; and, in that reſpect, his ſtile is exceedingly different from that of Herodotus, which has all the appearance of truth and ſincerity. His narrative, however, is intelligible enough to a good Greek ſcholar; but in his orations, in which he abounds, I think, more than any other hiſtorian, his arguments are ſo crowded and complicated together, that they are little better than a riddle. His numbers too are harſh and uncouth, and his cadences as abrupt, and ſuch as cheat the ear almoſt as much, as thoſe of Tacitus. In ſhort, he is a moſt ſtriking example of the danger of affecting ſingularity, and endeavouring to diſtinguiſh one's ſelf in that way from all the other writers before you, which, as the Halicarnaſſian tells us, was

Thucydides's motive for writing ſo extraordinary a ſtile of hiſtory *; and, indeed, it is the way by which the taſte of all the arts, poetry as well as proſe writing, painting, ſtatuary, and architecture, has been at different times corrupted. Thucydides thought, that, if he wrote a plain and perſpicuous ſtile, it would not be new and ſingular; he therefore laboured to make it obſcure, that is, he laboured to write ill, which is, as I have obſerved elſewhere †, one of the greateſt faults that any ſtile can have, and which, more than any other, offends the judicious reader.

The ſecond Greek hiſtorian I ſhall mention in this chapter, is Xenophon, whoſe ſtile is perfectly different, and goes, I think, to the other extreme; for it is rather too plain and ſimple, and is more the ſtile of the Socratic dialogue than of hiſtory. His expedition of Cyrus abounds too much with characters, and in that reſpect is too

* Dionyſius, *De Thucydide Judicium*, cap. 24.

† Vol. III. lib. iv. chap. 10. p. 182. 183.

like to biography *. They are no doubt very inſtructive and entertaining, and in ſuch a work as *The life of Ageſilaus*, or *The education of Cyrus*, are very proper: But, in a piece of hiſtory, ſuch as *The retreat of the* 10,000, I think they are not ſo proper, and far leſs in the hiſtory of a nation. Even in the hiſtory of one war only, ſuch as the Peloponneſian, Thucydides has been ſo judicious as not to introduce them. But Xenophon, being bred in the ſchool of morals under Socrates, has adorned even his hiſtory with characters and manners, which he appears to have underſtood perfectly well.

But, in defence of Xenophon, may be ſaid what cannot be ſaid in behalf of our modern hiſtorians, that the *Anabaſis* was the hiſtory of the greateſt event of the life of a ſingle man; ſo that it may be conſidered as a kind of biography, in which it was very proper to give the character of Cyrus, and not improper to give alſo the characters of ſome of the principal perſons concerned with him in that expedition; whereas, in his *Hellenica*, or *hiſtory of*

* Page 397. of this Volume.

Greece, it would have been improper; and accordingly he has not done it.

The laſt Greek hiſtorian I ſhall mention in this chapter, is Diodorus Siculus, whoſe ſtile certainly deſerves the eulogium that Photius gives it, *of not being too Attic.* But, I think, it is too little Attic, by which I mean that it is too little ornamented, and too like to common ſpeech: And, though it have a great deal of the ſimplicity of Xenophon, it has not his ſweetneſs, nor thoſe Attic graces, which abound in his ſtile.

As to his *matter*, though his plan be more comprehenſive than that of Herodotus, he is more inferior, both to Herodotus and Xenophon, in the *matter* than in point of *ſtile.* And he appears to me to have had a worſe affectation than that of Thucydides, which was to diſtinguiſh himſelf from the authors that had written before him in the relation of facts, ſo as to appear quite new and original in that reſpect. This muſt be evident to every man, who compares his hiſtory of Xerxes's invaſion

of Greece, with the ſame hiſtory given us by Herodotus; and, particularly, his deſcription of the two ſea fights at Artemiſium, of the battle of Plataea, but, above all, of the famous action at Thermopylae, of which he has made a moſt romantic ſtory, by telling us, that the Spartans, in the night time, penetrated into the Perſian camp, and got even to the tent of Xerxes, where they killed every body except Xerxes himſelf; and then, the day breaking, the whole Perſian army was alarmed, and ſurrounding the Greeks, cut them to pieces in the middle of the camp. This is a fiction, which, though it had been more credible in itſelf, never could have paſſed for truth at the time, or near the time, when the action at Thermopylae happened; becauſe the monument of the Spartans that fell there, was then ſtanding upon a little riſing ground, in the narroweſt part of the paſs, near to the wall which the Perſians demoliſhed, and tumbled the ruins of it upon the Greeks *.

* Herodotus, lib. vii. cap. 223. 225.

And he has given us a hiſtory of *The retreat of the* 10,000, very different from the account given by Xenophon, who was one of the commanders of that *retreat*.

Nor is Diodorus Siculus the only ancient author, who has indulged himſelf in the pleaſure of telling wonderful ſtories at the expence of truth. Dion Caſſius has given us a deſcription of Caeſar's battle with Arioviſtus, very different from that which Caeſar himſelf has given, yet not ſo different as a late editor and tranſlator of this author has made it. The name of this editor is *Samuel Reimerus*, who has publiſhed an edition of Dion Caſſius in folio at Hamburgh, in 1750, but, like ſeveral of the late German editors, appears not to have underſtood the language of his author: For he has made this author deſcribe the Romans as doing a thing in this battle, which they certainly did not do, and which, indeed, it is impoſſible to ſuppoſe that they could have done. They came on, ſays he, to the attack before they were in perfect order, and with ſuch velocity, that they deprived the barbarians of

the uſe of their darts, in which they confided ſo much, and even of their long ſwords; ſo that they were obliged immediately to take to their ſhort ſwords or daggers. Now, it is evident, both from the words of this particular paſſage, and from Dion's whole narrative of the battle, as well as from Caeſar's account of it, that it was the Germans who came on in this barbarous and diſorderly manner, not the Romans; and they made the attack with ſuch velocity, (ſo great, that I ſhould not have believed it was poſſible, if it had been related by any other author than Julius himſelf), that the Romans in a fair field, not ſurpriſed, but, on the contrary, prepared to receive the enemy, to whom they had offered battle ſome days before, and to whoſe camp they advanced that very day in order of battle, loſt the uſe of their *pilum*, a weapon to which, as Dion ſays, they truſted very much. And indeed they had good reaſon: For it was the beſt miſſive that ever was uſed by heavy-armed men, at leaſt ſince the heroic times; to which they owed, in a great meaſure, their victory over the *Helvetii*, according to the

account Caeſar has given us of that battle; with which, in another deſcribed by Caeſar, they killed the whole firſt rank of the Gauls; and with which, as Livy tell us, they killed even elephants. But this is an error, not of Dion Caſſius, but of his editor and tranſlator, who has plainly aſcribed to the Romans, what Dion has ſaid of the Barbarians: But it is the error of the author to make the Germans not attack in a phalanx, as Julius Caeſar ſaid they did; but, after they were beat and were going off, then to form different phalanxes of about 300 men each, which ſtood like ſo many towers, with the men ſo cloſely joined together that they did not fall when they were killed by the Romans; which no doubt is told as a circumſtance of wonder, and, I believe, was the reaſon for contriving thoſe ſtrange tower-like phalanxes. Dion is the leſs to be excuſed for ſuch fictions, that he muſt have ſeen, or had an opportunity of ſeeing, Julius Ceaſar's own account of the battle. As he is very fond of ſpeech-making, as well as of ſuch romantic deſcrip-

tions, he has given us a ſpeech of Julius Caeſar, which was certainly made before this battle, and indeed was very neceſſary in order to animate his men, who were ſo much diſcouraged by the frightful accounts they had heard of Arioviſtus and his Germans, that he was in hazard of being deſerted by them. This ſpeech in Dion is among the longeſt we have in hiſtory, conſiſting of near ſeven columns in folio, as it is printed in the edition above mentioned; whereas the ſpeech really made is, as Caeſar has given it us, a ſhort ſpeech, but very much more to the purpoſe than the long one of Dion. And he has not given us at all what paſſed in the conference betwixt Julius and Arioviſtus, though he has told us in general, that there was ſuch a conference; whereas, Caeſar has related at ſome length, what paſſed on both ſides, from which we learn, what the pretenſions were, both of the Romans and of Arioviſtus, and by what reaſons they were ſupported; which, I think, it was of importance that the reader ſhould know: And it is no doubt the buſi-

neſs of an hiſtorian to relate the cauſes and reaſons of a war, as well as the events of it.

His account of the battle of Pharſalia is ſtill more extraordinary than that of Arioviſtus's battle. Caeſar's deſcription of this deciſive action betwixt him and Pompey is the beſt I ever read of any battle; but Dion thought it below him to copy it, and has given us a battle of his own, very different indeed from that of Julius. In the firſt place, he has endeavoured to make a pathetic tragedy of it, by telling us, that the legions, before they engaged, ſtood facing one another for ſome time, deeply affected with the thought that Romans were to fight againſt Romans, ſons with their fathers, brothers with brothers, and friends with friends; and could not be perſuaded to advance to the charge, even by the ſignals of battle given by the generals, but continued ſtill to ſtand motionleſs, and, he adds, weeping and lamenting; neither did they begin the engagement, till

the foreign auxiliaries ſhowed them the way. Now, this is not only a fiction, but an abſurd and incredible fiction; for it is certain, that men fight with more animoſity in civil than in foreign wars; and it was particularly ſo in theſe civil wars among the Romans, called by Lucan *bella pluſquam civilia*; an expreſſion, which, if it has any good meaning, muſt denote that theſe wars were fiercer, and carried on with more animoſity than even civil wars commonly are. That there was no backwardneſs, at leaſt in Caeſar's army, but, on the contrary, the greateſt keenneſs to fight, is evident from the ſtory he tells us of Craſtinus the centurion, which nobody can believe to be a lye. 2*dly*, In the deſcription of the battle he is as circumſtantial as any poet: But his circumſtances are not ſo well choſen as thoſe of Homer's battles; for they are trivial and common to all battles, ſuch as theſe; —'Some were flying, ſome purſuing; ſome 'were vanquiſhed, ſome were victorious; 'ſome were wounded, and ſome killed thoſe 'that wounded them:' And the only remarkable circumſtance he mentions, but which I

think incredible, is, that ſome, who were killed by their friends and relations, did, when they were dying, ſend, in the middle of the battle, their laſt commands to their friends and families at home, by thoſe who had killed them. And, *laſtly*, he has omitted to relate that order and diſpoſition of the battle, by which Julius gained the victory; I mean the drafting out of his third line ſix cohorts, and making of them a fourth line, which, upon a ſignal given, attacked Pompey's cavalry, in which he was much ſuperior to Caeſar; and, accordingly, they had got the better of Caeſar's cavalry, when theſe ſix cohorts fell upon them, and, as Pompey had neglected to provide a corps de reſerve of infantry to ſupport them, drove them off the field; then cut to pieces Pompey's archers and ſlingers; and, laſt of all, flanked and ſurrounded Pompey's legions, who were ſtill making a ſtout reſiſtance, though Pompey, by fooliſhly, as I think, altering the Roman method of running on to the attack, and making his men ſtand motionleſs in the line to receive the enemies charge, had done a

great deal to damp their ſpirit and reſolution, as well as to leſſen the force of their ſpears, which muſt have been thrown with much greater force when they were running, than when they were ſtanding ſtill. This battle, therefore, Caeſar did not gain, as he modeſtly ſays he gained the moſt of his battles, 'by the valour of his 'ſoldiers,' but by his own conduct, and his ſuperiority in genius and military ſkill to his antagoniſt Pompey. In one particular, however, he gives great praiſe to his ſoldiers even in this battle; for he ſays, that they, perceiving Pompey's ſoldiers did not advance to meet them, ſtopped in the middle of the courſe, and took breath, not by any command from him, which there was no time to give, but taught, as he ſays, by their great experience in war; the conſequence of which was, that Pompey's deſign, of taking them breathleſs and exhauſted by ſo long a courſe, was not only diſappointed, but turned againſt him.

Appian, in his hiſtory of the Roman civil wars, has given us much the ſame account of this battle, but not quite ſo pe-

tical, nor ſo much loaded with circumſtances, and in much better language, as he lived in a better age, and is a much more elegant writer than Dion, who, I think, is among the worſt writers of later times; and there is hardly any ſo bad, till we come down to the decline of the Greek empire, when they wrote a language that was neither Greek nor Latin, but a mixture of both, and hardly intelligible. But he has a deſcription of another battle, viz. the battle of Zama, which I think more extravagant and ridiculous than any thing to be found even in Dion Caſſius: For he has made quite a Homeric battle of it, the generals, as he tells us, fighting hand to hand with one another, Hannibal firſt with Scipio, whom he wounded and diſmounted, and then with Maſiniſſa the Numidian King: And he has omitted to tell us, as Dion has done in the deſcription of the battle of Pharſalia, how the victory was gained; namely, by Scipio's ſuperiority in horſe, of which Polybius, the moſt judicious and authentic hiſtorian, has taken care to inform us.

And here I cannot help obſerving, that almoſt all theſe later hiſtorians among the ancients, as well as Dion Caſſius and Appian, have made their hiſtories rather rhetorical and poetical exerciſes, than authentic narratives, and have ſtudied more to amuſe and ſurpriſe their readers, than to inſtruct them in the truth of facts.

I will ſay nothing at preſent of modern hiſtories, but will refer them to the concluſion of what I have further to add upon the ſubject of the ſtile of hiſtory. I conclude therefore this chapter and this volume, with obſerving in general, that the works of ſuch hiſtorians as Julius Caeſar and Xenophon, who were not only contemporary with the facts they relate, but were principal actors in them, or of ſuch an author as Herodotus, who lived in the next age after that great event of Xerxes's invaſion of Greece, and converſed, as he tells us, with men who lived at that time, are of much greater value to a man who does not read merely for amuſement but is ſtudious of truth, than any compilements

of hiſtory from hearſay, or from authors that had written before; for we are not only more aſſured of the facts related by the contemporary hiſtorians, but we learn what, I think, is of more value, the arts, manners, and opinions, of the age, which are almoſt wholly loſt in our modern compilements of hiſtory.

The next volume will begin with an account of the hiſtorians, Greek and Latin, who have written the hiſtory of the greateſt empire, and of the longeſt duration, that ever was in the world; I mean the Roman empire: After which, I will make ſome obſervations upon our modern hiſtorians; and then I will proceed, according to the method I have laid down, to treat of the didactic, the rhetorical, and the poetical ſtiles, with which, and ſome general obſervations upon the utility of ancient learning, I will conclude this work, OF THE ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF LANGUAGE.

END OF VOLUME FOURTH.

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
305 De Neve Drive - Parking Lot 17 • Box 951388
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1388
Return this material to the library from which it was borrowed.

AC MAY 0 1 2002
NOV 20 00
OCT 1 8 2005

3 1158 01121 2627

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 001 292 738 0